SPECIALIZED CATHOLIC ACTION IN THE UNITED STATES, 1936-1949:

IDEOLOGY, LEADERSHIP, AND ORGANIZATION

A THESIS
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

by

Dennis Michael Robb

Part 1

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

June, 1972

XUM

PLEASE NOTE:

Some pages may have
indistinct print.
Filmed as received.

University Microfilms, A Xerox Education Company

XUM

CONTENTS

PREFACE ii

CHAPTER

I. ORGANIZING CATHOLIC LAY ACTIVITY, 1936-1937 1

II. CLUBS, CONFERENCES, AND CELLS 42

III. SPECIALIZED CATHOLIC ACTION, 1936-1940 . 82

IV. FORMULATING AN IDEOLOGY, 1938-1940 . . . 123

V. BUILDING A PROGRAM, 1942-1945 165

VI. EUROPEAN INFLUENCES AND CONTACT, 1945-1946 218

VII. THE CRUCIAL SUMMER, 1947 260

VIII. AUTONOMOUS LAY MOVEMENTS, 1947-1949 . . 293

CONCLUSION. 333

BIBLIOGRAPHY 342

XUM

PREFACE

The pages that follow interpret the origins and early growth of specialized Catholic Action in the United States from 1936 to 1949. In this study I attempt to reduce a significant gap in historical literature dealing with American Catholics. As far as I know, no other historian to date has attempted to give a general description or interpretative analysis of the manner in which Catholic leaders tried to implement the papal call for "Catholic Action." Nine years ago, Daniel Callahan could assert confidently that there existed no history of the American Catholic laymen's role in the Church.[1] Four years later, David J. O'Brien lamented the failure of most historians investigating the phenomenon of American Catholicism to advance beyond parochial topics like episcopal biography and to explore the interaction between Catholics and the total American culture.[2] More recently, Philip Gleason observed that it was difficult to think of works that systematically examined the channels of communication and influence

---

[1] Daniel Callahan, The Mind of the Catholic Layman (New York, 1963), x.

[2] See David J. O'Brien, "American Catholic Historiography: A Post-Conciliar Evaluation," Church History, XXXVII (March, 1968), 80-94.

XUM

which linked the American Church to European sources of thought and activity.[3] Thomas T. McAvoy, in his last published work, suggested that future generations with diaries, letters, and other records then attainable would have to determine when the movements stirring in American Catholocism first joined with the aggiornmento of Pope John XXIII.[4]

This book is probably too selective to meet the desires of such historians. In this work I seem to wander far from the investigation of the interaction of Catholics and American culture for which they call. It is my respect for their critical acumen and broad perspectives rather than disagreement with their views which led me to a detailed examination of the interplay of ideology, leadership, and organization in the three American movements of specialized Catholic Action.

Every book has a history of its own. I began my research at a time when journalists and scholars, fascinated with the Second Vatican Council, were taking a new look at the American Catholic Church. I intended to examine the role of independent lay movements in inaugurating social and theological change within

---

[3] Philip Gleason, "Introduction," in Gleason, ed., Contemporary Catholicism in the United States (Notre Dame, Indiana, 1969), xvi. See also Gleason, "Introduction," in Gleason, ed., Catholicism in America (New York, 1970), 1-9.

[4] Thomas T. McAvoy, C.S.C., A History of the Catholic Church in the United States (Notre Dame, Indiana, 1969), 452.

American Catholicism, in promoting structural changes within official Catholic agencies, and in paving the way for the renewal movements originating at the time of the Council. My study, I then concluded, might uncover new dimensions of cultural conflict within the supposed doctrinal unity of American Catholicism. I intended to focus on the religious and social attitudes of articulate lay leaders who determined to work outside of the official Catholic structures. I planned to examine the relationship between voluntary lay associations and those sponsored by the American hierarchy and interdenominational and secular organizations. My preliminary hypothesis was that the foundations for the wide-spread attitudinal and organizational changes that seemed to be taking place within the American Catholic community during the 1960's had been laid decades before. I objected particularly to The De-Romanization of the American Catholic Church. I felt that book erred seriously by assuming that the vast changes taking place in American Catholicism were of recent origin, dating to the influence of the beloved Pope John XXIII and the "new theology."

I initially set four guidelines for myself. I would attempt to enlarge the scope of American Catholic historiography by uncovering materials which other scholars in the field had not examined. I would try to uncover the true story by discounting the polemic considerations which then seemed to obscure a balanced presentation. I would set forth a clearer picture of organizational activities within the Church and the socio-religious attitudes of American Catholics who anticipated, in some fashion, the new era begun by the Second Vatican Council. I would support my generalizations with primary materials.

It was adherence to this last guideline which led me to the story which follows. Early in my research I discovered why so many historians of American Catholicism had followed the "episcopal synthesis." Efforts to gather and organize collections of material dealing with lay organizations had been almost totally neglected. This manuscript deals with specialized Catholic Action, even though I originally planned to ignore completely the Young Christian Workers, the Young Christian Students, and the Christian Family Movement and to discuss other lay movements I regarded as more important and more realistic about social reform. I soon discovered that it would be almost impossible to accomplish that task if I wanted generalizations to rest on solid evidence. I also learned that leaders of the specialized movements confronted the issues which led other lay movements beyond the official structures. It was their leaders who seriously examined the principles and techniques of "official Catholic Action."

Early in my research I discovered that Aaron I.

XUM

Abell's excellent _American Catholicism and Social Action_ did not, in fact, "tell the story of Catholic social reform in its integral fullness."[5] I learned much from David O'Brien's _American Catholics and Social Reform_, but soon realized that his work needed a supplement. Very early I detected that the papal call for a social apostolate led to disagreements not only about the meaning of the social encyclicals but "Catholic Action," the organized lay apostolate which Pope Pius XI felt would translate his social principles into action. I discovered different sets of principles, techniques, and plans for the organized activity of Catholic laymen, resting upon different conceptions of the structure and function of lay organizations. These conceptions, in turn, rested upon terminological and theological guidelines expounded by the Holy See and by European theologians. Clerics concerned with organizing Catholic laymen looked respectively to Belgium, France, or Rome for guidance.

The objective of this book is to examine in detail the development within the United States of movements whose aim was to form lay apostles laboring daily to reconstruct society according to the mind of Christ. As a movement designed for spiritual renewal and social involvement, specialized Catholic Action raised serious questions with both theological and sociological implications. I have used three explanatory concepts to organize what I see as the essential developments, namely, ideology, leadership, and organization. That conceptual structure, however, arose from the evidence itself. It was not until I was deep into the research and writing that I realized this triad not only conveniently organized the material but reflected a basic concern of all those thinking about and trying to organize "Catholic Action." Terminology and structure were important concerns for all involved.

---

[5] Aaron I. Abell, _American Catholocism and Social Action: A Search for Social Justice_ (rpt., Notre Dame, Indiana, 1963), [8].

The verbal battles which sometimes broke out remained unsettled during the period I have treated. It was not until the Second World Congress for the Lay Apostolate, held in Rome, October 5-13, 1957, that Pope Pius XII took effective action to counter the "widespread uneasiness which arises from the use of the term 'Catholic Action.'"[6] By that time, the figures prominent in the specialized lay movements were associated with the reform and renewal of the Catholic Church, especially regarding the role of the layman. Since these latter events take on significance only in the context of the earlier stages of specialized Catholic Action, I intend to treat them in a separate book.

---

[6] Guiding Principles of the Lay Apostolate, Address of His Holiness Pope Pius XII to the Second World Congress of the Lay Apostolate, October 5, 1957 (Washington, [1957]), 9.

XUM

In this study I incorporate the most useful aspects of the standard studies of Catholic social action, while avoiding their relative inattention to "Catholic Action." I am indebted to those who have covered the ground before me. In preparing this manuscript, I owe special thanks to numerous individuals. I gratefully acknowledge the cooperation of Mrs. Mary Irene Zotti and Rt. Rev. Msgr. Reynold Hillenbrand, who made available to me the papers and records of the movements with which they worked. Archie Motley, manuscripts librarian at the Chicago Historical Society, provided me much assistance in my initial attempts to discover and deposit the collections of individuals and organizations. At the University of Notre Dame Archives Larry Bradley was similarly helpful. Louis Putz, C.S.C., Edward Marciniak, Patrick and Patty Crowley, and Burnie Bauer supplied much information which extant collections make unavailable. I owe special thanks to Timothy L. Smith, whose suggestions and criticisms made this work possible.

Words cannot convey the help I received from Carol, my wife, whose love and devotion during the years of research and writing sustained, encouraged, and supported me.

XUM

CHAPTER ONE

ORGANIZING CATHOLIC LAY ACTIVITY, 1936-1937

In the 1930's many Catholic leaders in the United States intensified efforts to organize laymen and priests to promote social reconstruction. The early years of the depression acted as a catalyst, and churchmen concerned with social problems became bolder in espousing their views.[1] By interpreting and applying the teachings of Catholicism to American problems, the Church's leadership hoped to achieve a "unified program of Catholic social action."[2] Since the publication in 1919 of the _Bishop's Program for Social Reconstruction_, the American bishops had hoped to develop mutual cooperation and service in what they called the "social apostolate," that is, the active lay defense and promotion of the Church's social doctrine, through the Social Action Department of the

---

[1] George Q. Flynn, _American Catholics and the Roosevelt Presidency, 1932-1936_ (Lexington, 1968), 22. See Aaron Abell, "The Catholic Church and the American Social Question," in Waldemar Gurian and M.A. Fitzsimons, ed., _The Catholic Church in World Affairs_ (South Bend, 1954), 396.

[2] David J. O'Brien, _American Catholics and Social Reform: The New Deal Years_ (New York, 1968), 183.

National Catholic Welfare Conference.[3] Led by Monsignor John A. Ryan and Reverend Raymond McGowan, this department played a central role in the Church's response to social issues, but by the early 1930's organizations representing alternative perspectives began to emerge.

Movements which represented a departure in method and spirit from the more traditional forms of Catholic organizational life made more explicit the subtle competition which had always existed between contending plans and principles. Leaders began to reflect on the questions of who would organize the social ministry of the Church and what techniques would bring success. Such

---

[3] For a history and status of the National Catholic Welfare Conference (hereafter referred to as N.C.W.C.), see Msgr. John Tracy Ellis, American Catholicism (2nd ed., rev.; Chicago, 1969), 141-44; and Thomas T. McAvoy, A History of the Catholic Church in the United States, (Notre Dame, 1969), 381-83, 401, 403, 405. Austin Dowling, archbishop of St. Paul, Minnesota, gave perhaps the best description of the organization when he explained that "the National Catholic Welfare Conference is the Bishops of the United States, meeting yearly at Washington for mutual conference, deliberation, and decisions on matters of general public concern, on the defense and welfare of the Church in the United States. It has no existence apart from the Hierarchy. But it is not the Hierarchy of the United States meeting for the purpose of ecclesiastical legislation and authorized recommendations thereon. Such would be a Plenary Council." In short, he explained, the organization was "a voluntary association of the Bishops. It has not and never can have any mandatory or legislative power. Nothing can be done in a diocese except by the permission of the Ordinary...." From the N.C.W.C. pamphlet, The National Catholic Welfare Conference: The Agency of the Archbishops and Bishops of the United States for the Promotion of Unity in Catholic Work (Washington, 1927), 8. See also Administrative Board, N.C.W.C., The National Catholic Welfare Conference: Its Organization, Departments and Functions, (Washington, 1935), passim.

XUM

questioning gradually laid bare crucial distinctions between "social education" and "social action," and disagreements arose over the correct interpretation of the Holy See's prescriptions for social reconstruction and its official guidelines for Catholic Action. At the heart of the ensuing debates stood three issues, namely, ideology, leadership, and organization. The result was the slow development of entirely different positions on the nature and means of Christian social witness.[4]

At one extreme and of major significance for the Catholic intellectual left stood the Catholic Worker movement.[5] Founded by Peter Maurin and Dorothy Day in May, 1933, the movement spread from one "House of Hospitality" on the Lower East Side of New York to Boston, Philadelphia, Chicago, Baltimore, St. Louis, and other industrial centers.[6] Excoriating Catholic indifference to the social crisis in the United States and Europe and

---

[4] See Martin Work and Daniel J. Kane, "The American Catholic Layman and His Organizations," in Philip Gleason, ed., _Contemporary Catholicism in the United States_ (South Bend, 1969), 355, 359; and O'Brien, 182-85. Paul Hanly Furfey, in _The Morality Gap_, (New York, 1969), 94, captures one facet of the disagreements when he suggests that "personalist action groups contrast with what may be called _mass-action_ organizations...[which] are likely to be inaugurated by persons in authority who use their prestige to attract members."

[5] A number of studies recount the activities and thought of the Catholic Worker movements: see especially Neil Betten, "Catholicism and the Industrial Worker During the Great Depression," Diss. Univ. of Minnesota 1968, 126-168; and O'Brien, 182-211.

[6] Work and Kane, 356; Furfey, 100-03; and Dorothy Day, _House of Hospitality_ (New York, 1939), _passim_.

XUM

urging a new economic system to replace what they viewed as a decadent capitalism, its local units introduced many Catholics to the idea of Christian social action, to the liturgical movement, and to the writings of European social thinkers.[7] Based on a philosophy of "Christian personalism" and upon the Holy Father's injunction to "go to the working man, especially to the poorest of them," Catholic Workers felt that the only way they could show their love for God was by love of their fellows expressed through constant and personal works of mercy.[8]

---

[7] Work and Kane, 356.

[8] See Emmanuel Mounier, *Révolution personnaliste et communautaire* (Paris, 1935), *passim*., for a classic statement of "Christian personalism." See also Paul Hanly Furfey, *Fire on the Earth* (New York, 1936), 79-97; Furfey, *The Morality Gap*, 89-113; "Catholic Worker Program," *The Catholic Worker*, I (December 15, 1933), 4; Peter Maurin, "Christ the King Alone Can Reconstruct the World," *ibid*., II (October, 1934), 1, 6; Maurin, "A Program for Immediate Needs," *ibid*., II (January, 1935), 1, 7; Maurin and John Cummings, "Is Political Action an Answer?" *ibid*., II (June, 1934), 6; Maurin, "Communitarian Personalism," *ibid*., IV (September, 1936), 1; "Personalism and Communitarianism," *ibid*., IV (October, 1936), 8; "Points for Perusal: The Catholic Worker Program, Personalism," *Chicago Catholic Worker*, I (September, 1938), 4. David L. Lewis, in "Emmanuel Mounier and the Politics of Moral Revolution: Aspects of Political Crises in French Liberal Catholicism, 1935-1938," *The Catholic Historical* Review, LVI (July, 1970), 267, explains that "personalism was an eclectic philosophy which endeavored both to criticize and to supply a Christian foundation to the anti-capitalist thought of the period." For the personalist emphasis on the spiritual and corporal works of mercy, see "Points for Perusal: The Catholic Worker Program, Works of Mercy," *Chicago Catholic Worker*, I (October, 1938), 2, which quotes Maurin to the effect that "God wants us to be our brothers' keeper" and that "to feed the hungry, to clothe the naked, to shelter the homeless, to instruct the ignorant, at a personal sacrifice, is what God wants us to do."

XUM

Through the columns of its newspaper, The Catholic Worker, the leaders of the movement sought to further their social program, to popularize the social teachings of the Church, and to build up the idea of Christian solidarity among working men. Addressed to those who "saw no hope for the future, no recognition of their plight," the editors called their readers to recognize "the fact that the Catholic Church has a social program."[9] They insisted that radical Catholic thought must go beyond social security legislation and unemployment insurance and penetrate to the root of the social problem by demanding the replacement of modern finance-capitalism with a new, Christian social order.[10] Members favored direct action aimed at countering the evil of industrial society and demanded "an unbloody Christian revolution that would dethrone materialism and restore the primacy of the spiritual."[11]

An integral part of the Catholic Worker program was the farm commune. By the establishment of Houses of Hospitality in urban centers they hoped to exemplify the idea of personal responsibility for the poor. In communal farming, they attempted to demonstrate a way of life in which men once more could assume personal responsibility for their own economic salvation instead of depending upon the urban collective.[12] Through voluntary poverty, the practice of the spiritual and corporal works of mercy, and by going "back to the land," Catholics would not only grow in personal holiness but would bear witness to the disordered values of modern civilization. No revolution, insisted Miss Day, could succeed without a theory of revolution. "We have that theory for the Catholic revolution," she added, "but the problem is how to popularize it...."[13]

---

[9] "To Our Readers," The Catholic Worker, I (May 1, 1933), 4.

[10] See Day, xxxv, 71-74, 75.

[11] Richard L.G. Deverall, "How Radical Must We Be?" Chicago Catholic Worker, I (September, 1938), 2.

Though many social thinkers found the emphasis on the return to the land and the fostering of Christian agrarianism an inadequate solution to the crisis of industrialism, the movement received some popular support. The newspaper mushroomed from an original distribution of twenty-five hundred copies monthly to over 100,000. The movement crossed the ocean to both England and

---

[12] See Peter Maurin, "To the Bishops of the United States: A Plea for Houses of Hospitality," The Catholic Worker, I (October, 1933), 1; "Houses of Hospitality Real Need Today," ibid., I (February 1, 1934), 5; "Farming Commune," ibid., II (March, 1935), 5; "Catholic Worker Celebrates 3rd Birthday; A Restatement of C.W. Aims and Ideals," ibid., IV (May, 1936), 1, 6; "Farming Commune is Finally Underway; Workers Planting Now; More Ready to Go," ibid., 1; "What We Are Doing in Town and Country," ibid., IV (September, 1936), 2; "Distributist Groups Swing into Action," ibid., IV (November, 1936), 3; and "Farm Commune," Chicago Catholic Worker, I (May, 1939), 1.

[13] Dorothy Day, "Trade Unions and the Lay Apostolate," in Conferences in Catholic Action: Proceedings of The Catholic Action Conference (Milwaukee, 1937), 91.

Australia, where local editions of the newspaper soon appeared.[14] It served as a catalyst for Catholic intellectuals and acted directly and indirectly as the primary source of Catholic radical activities during the 1930's.[15] Other periodicals edited by persons more or less closely associated with it began to appear in 1936: the Christian Front, edited by Norman McKenna and Richard Deverall, the Social Forum, published by a group in Canada, and Liturgy and Sociology, organ of the Campion Propaganda Committee, an affiliated CW group based in New York.[16] From it sprang such organizations as the Association of Catholic Trade Unionists and the Catholic Radical Alliance. In later years editors and writers for national liberal Catholic periodicals often acknowledged the early inspiration of their participation.[17]

Less visible, less influential but also more clearly guided by official Catholic social philosophy was the Catholic League for Social Justice.[18] Organized in 1932 by a group of laymen associated with the Calvert Associates and _Commonweal_ magazine before _The Catholic Worker_ began its spectacular growth, the League did not accept the radical view of the depression and of the action needed to combat it which Peter Maurin espoused. Its leaders appear to have respected the sincerity of the priests and laymen who had associated themselves with the Catholic Worker movement, but they felt that their interpretation of Pius XI's encyclical, _Reconstructing the Social Order_, was too eclectic. In that document, which played a pivotal role in Catholic interpretations of the depression and of the New Deal, the Pontiff had outlined the principles upon which social reconstruction should proceed and had called for the cooperation of both labor and capital in the formation of vocational guilds.[19] According to the Holy Father, prosperity would be restored to the socio-economic order according to the "true principles of a sane corporative system" in which all "occupational groups" would develop "harmonious unity."[20] The League regarded itself as promoting through the "study and application of the teachings of Pius XI" the formation of the new society the Holy Father had called for.[21]

---

[14] See "Dorothy Day: Lay Apostle to the Poor," Chicago Catholic Worker, II (April 25, 1940), 11.

[15] Betten, 196.

[16] Furfey, The Morality Gap, 101.

[17] Betten, 196.

[18] See Aaron Abell, American Catholicism and Social Action: A Search for Social Justice (1960; rpt. Notre Dame, Ind., 1963), 242-46; Michael P. Forster, "Michael J. O'Shaugnessy and His Reform Program: A Catholic Businessman's Interpretation of the Papal Design for a New Social Order," M.A. thesis, Univ. of Notre Dame 1965, passim.; and Flynn, 33-34.

---

[19] Flynn, 23-25; O'Brien, 182-83. The phrase "vocational guilds" is but one of the many English expressions used to translate the _ordines_ of the Latin text in papal encyclicals. The term has variously been translated as "vocational groups," "occupational groups," "ranks," "orders," and "guilds." Through the efforts of Msgr. Francis J. Haas and Rev. Raymond McGowan, the phrase "Industries and Professions" was approved by the Apostolic Delegate, Amelio G. Cicognani. See Joseph D. Munier, _Some American Approximations to Pius XI's "Industries and Professions"_ ("The Catholic University of America Studies in Economics, Volume 10," Washington, 1943), 1, n.2.

Michael J. O'Shaugnessy, an oil executive and journalist, was the leading spirit in the League for Social Justice. In its official organ, the Social Justice Bulletin, he outlined a plan to bring the United States out of the depression by organizing trade associations in all industries. Under a directorate composed of management, labor, and the consumer, these associations would stabilize production and prices and promote a more equitable distribution of wealth.[22] Sixty-five bishops in the United States, along with several in Canada and Mexico, publicly expressed their approval of the League, but it enrolled no more than ten thousand members and gathered little publicity.[23] It enjoyed active support in twenty-four dioceses in the way of recorders, who circulated membership pledges, and organization committees, which sponsored study clubs and discussion groups.[24] The League, however, offered little more than a forum for liberal Catholics to express their social views. O'Shaugnessy's plan was circulated among members of Roosevelt's cabinet but had little impact. Nevertheless, he continued to publish his monthly review of current events and social principles until 1943.[25]

---

[20] See Encyclical Letter of Pope Pius XI on "Atheistic Communism" (Vatican Press trans., Washington, 1937), 21-22.

[21] Flynn, 33; Forster, 37.

[22] Flynn, 33-34; Abell, American Catholicism and Social Action, 244-45.

[23] Abell, American Catholicism and Social Action, 245; Forster, 35.

Most of his ideas were taken over by the National Catholic Alumni Federation, an organization composed of male graduates from fifty-three Catholic colleges. In its early reactions to the depression the Federation faithfully reflected the Church's social teachings, as outlined in the encyclicals of Leo XIII and Pius XI. At its national convention in New York in November, 1932, leaders issued a call for a crusade to educate American industrialists to the fact that modern capitalism had failed and to promote the acceptance of papal principles by the entire nation.[26] The Federation undertook the sponsorship of regional meetings to promote social justice and began to develop a program "to direct the thought, study and action of affiliated alumni units and the hundreds of study clubs within those units."[27] Like O'Shaugnessy and his associates in the League for Social Justice, Federation leaders called for trade associations as a means of promoting economic stability. In their August, 1933 convention Federation officers published A Program of Social Justice, which they based on the encyclicals and on statements issued by the Administrative Committee of the N.C.W.C. In the same convention they added their voice to the widespread Catholic claim that President Roosevelt's National Recovery Administration was a concrete example of the New Deal's attempt to apply Christian social teaching to a depressed economy.[28]

---

[24] Abell, American Catholicism and Social Action, 245.

[25] Ibid. See Forster, 35-37; and Flynn, 34.

[26] Flynn, 30.

Federation officers were anxious to avoid the extreme of state absolutism, and they gradually shifted their emphasis from the organic nature of economic life which the Holy Father stressed to the defense of constitutional liberties. Some priests who thought the doctrines of "rugged individualism" and "economic liberalism" the real enemies of a Christianized America came to the conclusion that the Federation was moving toward the views of the American Liberty League. One powerful antagonist of this latter organization, Ignatius Cox, S.J., severely criticized the Federation and its program at the 1935 convention in Chicago when Paul Desverine, member of the American Liberty League and a prominent Federation leader, laid repeated stress on personal liberties and property rights. Cox complained that for three years all that the Federation of Catholic Alumni had done "was to talk in the abstract about principles of justice."[29] Another priest found that the Federation's pamphlet, entitled Today's Threat to Man's Liberties, showed little similarity to its pledge to study and apply the magisterial principles. "Read it from cover to cover," he told priests at a social action school, "and you will find only a few references to the social program of the Popes...."[30] He was exasperated by the fact that not a single encyclical was listed in the pamphlet's bibliography and argued that "any program of social justice adopted by a Catholic lay organization in the United States should follow completely the program of the Popes...."[31]

---

[27] Rev. Stephen Van Berkel, "Today's Threat to Man's Liberties," in Summary of Lectures, Summer School of Social Action for the Clergy Conducted at St. Francis Seminary, St. Francis, Wisconsin, July 5-30, 1937, I (Milwaukee, mimeographed booklet, 1937), 94.

[28] See Flynn, 78-102, for a close analysis of Catholic views of the National Recovery Administration.

Another new movement championing the cause of social justice was the National Union for Social Justice led by Father Charles Coughlin, the "radio priest" of

---

[29] Van Berkel, 96. See also Flynn, 198-99, for Cox's views of the real dangers to America of the Liberty League.

[30] Van Berkel, 97.

[31] Ibid.

Royal Oak, Michigan.[32] A powerful orator, the Detroit priest soon became to a vast audience the one churchman whose views they could trust.[33] Coughlin believed that "private money" was the key to the intricate economic problems of the depression and called for its abolition and the establishment of a central bank and nationalization of currency. Convinced that the glaring injustices which "permitted...plutocrats...to wax fat at the expense of the poor" must be combated, he directed members of his Union to devote a substantial part of their monthly meetings to serious discussion of his sixteen principles of social justice, most of which supported his case for drastic currency reform.[34]

---

[32] A number of studies analyze Coughlin and the National Union for Social Justice. See Charles J. Tull, Father Coughlin and the New Deal (Syracuse, 1965), passim,; David H. Bennett, Demagogues of the Depression: American Radicals and the Union Party, 1932-1936, (New Brunswick, N.J., 1969), esp. 27-84, 226-231, 254-57; Abell, American Catholicism and Social Action, 240-42; O'Brien, 150-181; Craig A. Newton, "Father Coughlin and His National Union for Social Justice," Southwestern Social Science Quarterly, XLI (December, 1960), 341-49; Flynn, 195-240; and James P. Shenton, "The Coughlin Movement and the New Deal," Political Science Quarterly, LXXIII (September, 1958), 353-373. Tull notes, 242, that "whatever success the organization enjoyed was clearly a personal victory for Coughlin...[who] dominated the movement completely." Shenton notes, 352, of the movement that "its history is particularly intriguing as it provides a portrait of the dissident personality who is attracted by such movements, a chance to examine the New Deal's response to dissidence, and a penetrating insight into the relationship of the Roman Catholic hierarchy to the New Deal." Bennett notes, 72, that "the National Union grew to be a major movement...," while Abell argues in American Catholicism and Social Action, 242, that "Coughlin's program made little appeal to Catholics of education and substance."

[33] Tull, 21. See also Shenton, 369.

Coughlin insisted that the Union was not a political organization but a "lobby of the people."[35] His paper, Social Justice, was read by hundreds of thousands of Americans who thought Coughlin offered "the promise of a far more sweeping remedy for their discontent than anything they found in the New Deal."[36] Opening membership in the National Union to persons of all faiths, Coughlin soon secured over five million signatures affirming his program.[37] With the encouragement of Michael Gallagher, bishop of Detroit, Coughlin assailed his most prominent Catholic critic, William Cardinal O'Connell, archbishop of Boston, as "notorious for his silence on social justice" and for making no contribution "in practice or in doctrine towards the distribution of wealth...."[38] In

---

[34] Tull, 61-64, 70-71, 152-53; Bennett, 69-71.

[35] Tull, 64, 113-14; Bennett, 68-69; O'Brien, 155-56.

[36] Shenton, 369.

[37] Tull, 79, cites Coughlin's assertion that over five million people had signed the sixteen-point programs and states, "There is no way to check these figures... but there is little reason to doubt this figure...." Bennett, 72, explains the confusion over how large the National Union actually became and suggests that "without the records of the organization, the best estimate is that the NUSJ had well over one million members but never approached the five million mark." Tull explains that Coughlin has consistently refused access to his files, while Bennett suggests that Coughlin has burned his papers and that the records of the National Union probably have been destroyed.

[38] Tull, 70; Bennett, 59; O'Brien, 176. See "Coughlin Criticizes Cardinal O'Connell," New York Times, December 10, 1934, 3.

XUM

justifying his own work he claimed that he was promoting the cause of social justice outlined in the encyclicals, as Pius XI had commanded all priests to do. He insisted that he was a politician only in the sense that he "followed Him who drove the money changers from the temple."[39] By 1936, however, the National Union was aligned directly against the administration. Deeply disturbed by the New Deal's refusal to remonetize silver, Coughlin had increasingly criticized government monetary policies through 1934 and early 1935; and in April of the election year he announced that his organization would enter the political arena.[40] After he became convinced that reelection of the President would mean "Roosevelt and Ruin," he declared Union party candidates William Lemke and Thomas C. O'Brien eligible for endorsement by his organization.[41] Campaigning vigorously for the defeat of Roosevelt throughout the summer and fall of 1936, he denounced him as a "liar" and as "a scab President," and accused the administration of "flirting with communistic tendencies."[42]

---

[39] Tull, 113. See also Bennett, 68-71; "In Politics?" Social Justice, I (March 13, 1936), 4; and "Father Coughlin's Sunday Radio Talk," ibid., 8-10.

[40] Bennett, 82.

[41] Ibid., 192-93. See Tull, 125; Charles E. Coughlin, "A Third Party," Vital Speeches of the Day, II (July 1, 1936), 613-16; and "Radio Challenge to Nation First Word of New Party," Social Justice, I (June 22, 1936), 3.

[42] Tull, 134, 147, 160-61; Bennett, 227-29; Shenton, 363.

The Coughlin movement, particularly the radio priest's vitriolic attacks on President Roosevelt, placed the Church in a very delicate situation. A growing number of Americans seemed to equate Coughlin's remarks with the official position of the Church. The great majority of clergy were avid supporters of Roosevelt, for they recognized his liberal approach to the Church and felt dismay that Coughlin's attacks were destroying the good relations it had developed with the administration. Further, his activities were alienating many non-Catholics who mistakenly looked upon him as an official spokesman. Walter Maier, professor at the Concordia Theological Seminary of St. Louis, publicly stated that "if ever Coughlinism should triumph...his church would capitalize the triumph, for the voice behind that radio priest is the voice of his church."[43] In an article on the political significance of the Coughlin movement, the editor of the New Republic judged it to signal the entrance of the Catholic Church into politics. Such statements reflected confusion about the precise relationship between the hierarchy and Coughlin.[44] Eager to correct these impressions, Chicago's Cardinal Mundelein stated publicly that, by virtue of his American

---

[43] See Flynn, 208-09, who quotes Maier's remarks from the New York Times, August 2, 1936, 12.

[44] For analyses of the problems Coughlin's activities caused the Church, see Flynn, 208-18; Tull, 143-44, 146, 147-49, 150-51, 156-58; McAvoy, 413-14; O'Brien, 177-78; and Shenton, 364-66.

XUM

citizenship, the Detroit priest had a right to his own political view but was "not authorized to speak for the Catholic Church, nor does he represent the doctrine or sentiments of the Church."[45]

Because of his concern for the political consequences of Coughlin's activities, John A. Ryan took on the role of public defender of the administration. On a radio network provided by the Democratic National Committee he attacked the Royal Oak pastor by name, labeling Coughlin's charges of communism against Roosevelt as ugly, cowardly, and flagrant calumnies. He insisted that Coughlin's economic thought was outdated and in no way connected with the papal encyclicals and urged workers to vote for F.D.R. The radio priest devoted an entire broadcast in answer. He quoted Pius XI to show that his crusade against the private control of money and credit directly followed papal thought. He acknowledged Ryan's pioneering social liberalism, but emphasized that the present day demanded a different approach to implementing established principles. The public argument clearly demonstrated disunity among Catholics claiming to promote the ideals of social justice.[46]

---

[45] See Flynn, 210-11, who quotes Mundelein's statement from William V. Shannon, The American Irish (New York, 1964), 317.

[46] For the dispute between Coughlin and Ryan, see Flynn, 223-28; Tull, 151-55; Shenton, 366; O'Brien, 137-38, 175; and Francis L. Broderick, The Right Reverend New Dealer: John A. Ryan (New York, 1963), 222-26.

Coughlin announced on November 7, 1936 that he was withdrawing from all radio activity, and in the week following the annual conference of American bishops took action to counteract the disunity they saw developing. Much of what transpired in the bishops' meeting is still unclear. From their known actions, however, it seems evident that they were determined to reassert their dominance over Catholic attempts to translate Christian social principles into action. Their deliberations evidently touched upon the question of both clerical and lay activity, for the bishops made clear that they expected "all Catholic organizations [to] work together in union with them and under their guidance" and reaffirmed their intention to promote "Unity in Catholic Work" through the N.C.W.C.[47]

The bishops approved in closed session a plan submitted by Edwin V. O'Hara, bishop of Great Falls, Montana, to establish "Priests' Schools of Social Action" in each region of the country.[48] Its purpose was to ensure full conformity to papal teachings and to provide a means by which priests engaged in social action should be, as the encyclical of Pope Pius XI directed, "duly prepared by an intensive study of the social question."[49] Available evidence offers no basis for determining whether this plan related directly to Coughlin, but Thomas T. McAvoy reports that "there were rumors of sharp words about him at the annual meeting of the hierarchy."[50] In any case, the bishops were concerned about imprudent priestly action, and they naturally turned to the Social Action Department, which had always played the leading role in formulating programs and in counseling the bishops on their public pronouncements on social questions. If priests by means of organized courses learned the exact requirements of the encyclicals, they could be of extraordinary help and avoid doing a good deal of harm.[51] A solid program of social education, Raymond McGowan explained, would decrease the possibility that individual priests would "take up some funny idea...and make that central in their work on economic questions."[52]

---

[47] N.C.W.C. leaflet, "Catholic Action" and "Catholic Activity" (Washington, [1936]), [2], [4].

[48] Raymond A. McGowan, "Clergy Hail Schools of Social Action," Catholic Action, XIX (August, 1937), 16.

The bishops also evidenced concern about lay action. When they established the Department of Lay Organizations as an integral part of their General Conference, they intended by this device to insure that the National Council of Men and Women should be the means of fostering

---

[49] Pope Pius XI, Encyclical Letter on Reconstructing the Social Order (Washington, 1942), 52.

[50] McAvoy, 414.

[51] Rev. Paul Tanner, "Principles Regarding the Work of the Priest," in Summer of Lectures, 17-18.

[52] Ibid., 17, quoting Raymond McGowan.

XUM

the episcopal program for the welfare of Christian society. In November, 1935 they had called to the attention of all Catholic groups "the distinction between Catholic activity and Catholic Action."[53] Now, one year later, they added particular applications to the general principles which supported their careful distinction.

In the more detailed statement published at the end of the 1936 conference, the church fathers placed great emphasis on the "voice" and "common mind of the Bishops," and set forth "general principles" regarding affiliation of "Catholic Societies" with the departments of the Conference. The statement explained that questions of the gravest import had faced and would continue to face the Church in the United States but that the bishops had provided in the N.C.W.C. a means whereby "each organization could assure itself of the Catholic position on any matter of national import." Any organization, therefore,

---

[53] The text of the 1935 statement reads: "The Bishops of the National Catholic Welfare Conference in the general meeting at Washington, November 14, 1935, call attention of all Catholic groups in the United States to the distinction between Catholic activity and Catholic Action. The bishops remind all groups according to the instructions of our Holy Father, Pope Pius XI, that there is no such thing as Catholic Action until there is an episcopal commission. For a diocese there must be a commission from the bishop of a diocese, for a province from the bishops of a province, and for the country from the bishops of the United States. The Holy Father only can give a commission for the universal Church on Catholic Action. When His Holiness does so he communicates with the bishops." Quoted from Raphael M. Huber, ed., *Our Bishops Speak: National Pastorals and Annual Statements of the Hierarchy of the United States, 1919-1951* (Milwaukee, 1952), 211-12.

XUM

which spoke categorically on a question that affected general interests without consulting "the mind of the Bishops" was "doing a disorderly thing." Since the authoritative voice of the Church in matters of common interest in any diocese was that of the Bishop, even a just claim to expert knowledge did not qualify an organization to speak for the Church. Interstate or national societies could insure they were developing their activities in a way which promoted Catholic unity by affiliating themselves with the Department of Lay Organizations. Before undertaking action, the Bishops declared, organizations should ascertain whether their program was in line with the mind of the Bishops, expressed through the Administrative Board of the Conference. Any national or interstate organization failing to observe the proper procedure ran "the risk of having its announced program disavowed...."[54]

In retrospect the significance of the bishop's statement stems not so much from its traditional call to unity or its emphasis on affiliation procedures as upon its careful restatement of papal pronouncements and its call for a stricter conception of "Catholic Action." The institutional purpose of "Catholic Action" was to foster "the participation by the laity in the hierarchical apostolate of the Church,"[55] under the direction of the bishops, who would coordinate the manifold activities of lay organizations.[56] A major attempt to dispel confusion concerning the manner in which lay responsibility and initiative should operate, the bishops' statement also marked the beginning of a vigorous campaign to develop an organized body of laymen who would defend the interests of the Church and work zealously to reorder American society. In their sharp distinction between "Catholic Action" and "Catholic activity" and in their technical reference to "the principles of Catholic Action" the American hierarchy expressed its concurrence with the Holy See's position that the Church would be better able "to defend the higher interests of the social order" if ecclesiastical authority had at its service a devoted, well-trained and organized laity.[57]

---

[54] For the full text of the 1936 statement, see "Affiliation of Lay Groups with N.C.W.C.: A Statement of General Principles and of Their Particular Application Promulgated at the 1936 Annual General Meeting of the Bishops of the United States," _Catholic Action_, XVIII (December, 1936), 18-21. A headnote to the text stated that it "should receive the careful attention of the members of all lay organizations, their spiritual directors and officers." See also N.C.W.C. leaflet, "_Catholic Action_" _and_ "_Catholic Activity_", _passim_., which incorporates the text into earlier material drawn from the 1927 pamphlet, cited in n.3.

The bishops obviously thought that some of those

---

[55] See Gianfranco Poggi, Catholic Action in Italy: The Sociology of A Sponsored Organization (Stanford, Cal., 1967), 23; Pope Pius XI, "Letter to Cardinal Bertram, Archbishop of Breslau," in The Pope and Catholic Action (London, 1937), 5.

[56] See "Letter of the English Hierarchy, 1934" in The Pope and Catholic Action, 22.

[57] See Guiseppe Cardinal Pizzardo, Conferences on Catholic Action (Washington, 1935), 5.

XUM

who were promoting Catholic social thought, as defined in the papal encyclicals, did not clearly understand that Pius XI had not only formulated principles to guide the reconstruction of the social order but had also chartered in "Catholic Action" the means to translate those principles into action. Repeatedly, the Pontiff had demonstrated his intention that this organized body of the laity play a central role in the Church's social apostolate. In a series of letters and instructions, the Pontiff had declared "Catholic Action" to constitute "a ministry which differs little from that of the clergy" and "an important and indeed indispensable need of our day." He had also insisted that Catholic Action "must have an organization which will control its members" so that, while uniting and coordinating all the Church's forces, it would "always preserve their autonomy" and members in turn would "faithfully carry out the instruction of their duly appointed leaders."[58] The American bishops faithfully echoed this point, declaring that "far from diminishing Catholic lay activity, or discouraging lay initiative" they intended cooperation with the National Catholic Welfare Conference "to guide such activity and make it effective in common action."[59] They envisioned Catholic Action as "a great crusade, well-planned, zealously fought, and ably generalled under the leadership of...[the] hierarchy."[60] But their pronouncement neither eliminated disagreement over the proper approach to social reconstruction nor paved the way for united action. Beyond suggesting the importance of episcopal authority and the desirability of common action, the bishops laid down no clear guidelines concerning the relation of lay organizations to the Christian reform of social institutions. Their statement skirted controversial issues, clouded important facts, and left unsettled the question of what methods lay organizations should employ. Experience might have suggested that from common principles different plans and programs often arose and that the task of developing new approaches to organization required not only a clarification of principles but a search for a method which would most effectively inspire and train the "lay apostles" for whom the Pope was calling. What had started as a disagreement over strategy and goals became a dispute over means and tactics.[61]

---

[58] See Pope Pius XI, "Letter to Cardinal Segura," in The Pope and Catholic Action, 11.

[59] See "Catholic Action" and "Catholic Activity," [3].

---

[60] See Philip A. Grau, "The Field of Catholic Action," in Conferences in Catholic Action: Proceedings of the Catholic Action Conference, 141.

[61] See O'Brien, passim; and Poggi, 17-18. Poggi suggests that in the Italian Opera dei Congressi disagreement over means and tactics led to a fight over strategies and goals. Catholic Action replaced the earlier organization. In the United States, with the possible exception of the Catholic Worker Movement, the disputes among those interested in "Catholic Action" and the social apostolate centered not so much on the broader goals and strategy as on the question of means and tactics.

XUM

From the onset of the depression Catholics concerned with economic, social and political questions had been unable to agree upon how to translate the Church's social principles into a concrete program. Many had proceeded on the apparent assumption that the term "Catholic Action" referred to whatever work they happened to be doing. Though the episcopal statement managed to reorient the rhetoric of such organizations, it failed to counter the diversity of their approaches to social reform. Their leaders echoed official pronouncements but used them to justify the plans and programs which they had already determined were most important.

Episcopal concern with this diversity of approach might have subsided in the months following their meeting had there not come from the Supreme Pontiff a resounding call for unity. In his encyclical on the social order, Pius XI had argued that in matters of social and economic welfare as well as in the fields of education and religion the dispersion of the Church's energies in too many directions sometimes reduced the effectiveness of its work.[62] In March, 1937, the Holy Father graphically portrayed his continuing preoccupation with such problems by issuing within a period of two weeks three new encyclicals. In the most important, Atheistic Communism, he declared that "entire peoples" seemed in danger of "falling back into a barbarism" and warned of the "imminent danger" of

---

[62] Pius XI, Reconstructing the Social Order, 53-54.

Communism. Stressing that "the most urgent need of the present day" was "the energetic and timely application of remedies" which would ward off this catastrophe, Pius urgently appealed for a unity which would encompass "every religious and lay organization in the Church."[63]

As in his previous social commentary, the Pope stressed the importance of lay action. In "these troublesome times," he noted, participation in Catholic Action offered "providential assistance" to the work of the clergy. Because in effect it was a social apostolate, it must train its members with special care to fight the battles of the Lord. He declared "this task of formation" to be "more urgent" than ever, always preceding "direct action in the field." Study-circles, conferences, lecture courses and "the various other activities undertaken with a view to making known the Christian solution of the social problem," Pius observed, were indispensable. To disseminate knowledge of fundamental principles, Catholic Action groups should organize propaganda on a large scale. The members should loyally and generously participate in the formation of new institutions and bring to them the Christian spirit. Though much had been done to bring the social teachings of the Church to the working man and the poor, he continued, the effort so far had been "inadequate." The doctrines of the Church must be consistently reduced to practice in everyday life. To this end, he argued, it was necessary to promote a wider study of social problems in the light of those doctrines.[64]

---

[63] Pius XI, On Atheistic Communism, 2, 28, 48.

Thus the encyclical by its renewed condemnation of Communism and its exhortation to the laity to dedicate themselves to "a cause which transcends all others in vital importance" added weight to the call of the American bishops for common action. The immediate aftermath of its publication was a new effort by N.C.W.C. to develop a united Catholic front and to formulate programs of social education. Field representatives of the Conference and staff members of sponsored diocesan programs soon had an opportunity to articulate more clearly the aims of the American hierarchy.

Archbishop Samuel A. Stritch summoned clergy, youth and adult lay delegates to a conference at Milwaukee's Hotel Schroeder in May, 1937, for the purpose of "educating...and energizing them in the works and questions of Catholic Action."[65] Although essentially a diocesan project, the Conference provided a forum for both national and local leaders to argue the urgent need of organized action to extend Catholic influence in public life. In an opening address, Vincent Mooney, a priest who was Director of the Catholic Youth Bureau which the N.C.W.C. had established one month earlier, declared, "We must unite our forces, if we would combat the enemy." He explained that through the new Bureau the energies of youth could be directed into the proper channels. Pointing to irresponsible leaders who attempted to inoculate youth with an anti-social, anti-American, and anti-Christian social philosophy, Mooney urged churchmen not to "sit idly by while youth is being organized all around us" and added: "Unless we provide a...program in keeping with youth's needs...others will do it for us."[66] Tess Marie Gorka, Secretary of the Catholic Youth Organization, Fort Wayne, Indiana, explained that the recent papal encyclical meant that unity was needed at once and would be "even more necessary in days to come." If Catholics were to strive toward unity, their program must be "governed by standard principles and policies and must be supervised by duly authorized diocesan leaders."[67]

---

[64] Pius XI, On Atheistic Communism, 45, 46-47.

[65] See [Paul-Tanner], "The Story of the Conference," Conferences in Catholic Action, 1.

Lenna Marie Wilson, field representative for the National Council of Catholic Women, urged upon the conference particular attention to the bishops' call to express Catholic faith in public action. Stressing that there was no such thing as Catholic Action without an episcopal commission, she encouraged a united front among women's organizations against the inroads of communism and atheism. Expressing her belief that the bishops and archbishops had provided for unitary action within the

---

[66] Vincent Mooney, C.S.C., "Does Catholic Youth Need a Program?" ibid., 9.

[67] Tess Marie Gorka, "The Basis of a Catholic Girl's Program," ibid, 23.

N.C.W.C., Mrs. Wilson insisted that only through their National Council could women "speak and act as a unit when the welfare of the Church or of the country demands [it]." Only with a "widespread organization" could Catholic women face with confidence the future problems confronting church and state.[68] Mrs. Earl R. Reynolds, national vice president of the Council, supplemented this position by reminding her listeners of an episcopal observation that "the Catholic women of America do not possess the influence in public life which either their numbers or the importance of their social principles deserve." As long as they remained unorganized or organized simply in parochial or provincial groups which had no "national organ of utterance," they would never attract public attention to their principles and so lack effective force.[69]

At the banquet which closed the Conference, William O'Connor, professor at the diocesan seminary, reviewed the basic questions of unity, harmony, solidarity and efficiency, in an analytic speech called "The Foundations of Catholic Action." He sketched the necessity of both lay enthusiasm and episcopal direction. A program to rehabilitate society must have enthusiasts, but be able to curb the zealots who were tempted to go off on a tangent because they thought they knew better than their leaders.

---

[68] Mrs. Earl R. Reynolds, "National Program of the National Council of Catholic Women," _ibid_., 103.

[69] _Ibid_.

Hence the need of organization and direction. In words that echoed recent episcopal statements, O'Connor explained that the term "Catholic Action" referred to "a specific kind of action which is inaugurated, sponsored, and directed by the hierarchy." Noting that this important principle was too often misunderstood, O'Connor quoted a recent declaration of the Apostolic Delegate in support of his argument that "Catholic Activity, that is not de facto and officially made participant in the mission of the Bishop of the diocese, is not Catholic Action." Without submission to ecclesiastical authority and willing obedience, therefore, there could be no successful, organized Catholic efforts.[70]

Throughout O'Connor's speech and in the repeated statements of Conference speakers there ran the suggestion of lay submissiveness to ecclesiastical authority. Mrs. George Fell, president of the Toledo Council of Catholic Women affirmed that a "devoted hierarchy and clergy" who were "thinking, planning, and ever ready to guide and serve" would help Catholics "keep our beloved country in the high ideals on which it was founded."[71] Laity could serve as "soldiers of Christ" and fight for the preservation of Christian values, but they should allow priests to develop the program of action, and follow "the opportunities for service" outlined by the Church.[72] Samuel Stritch made this point clear at the close of the Conference when he outlined the function of the permanent Archdiocesan Secretariat of Catholic Action he then established. He pointed to the need of coordinating within his own jurisdiction the work of the many Catholic organizations. The new secretariat, the archbishop explained, was "to aid each parish, each organization to participate more earnestly in Catholic Action." It would not aim at "the concentration of all Catholic activities into one bureaucracy" but rather at "the coordination of...groups to the program of Catholic Action outlined by ecclesiastical authority."[73] The chief sponsors of the Conference not only saw it as an acceptance of the challenge posed by atheists and communists but hoped it could set before the nation a standard for the apostolate of "Catholic Action."[74]

---

[70] See Rev. William P. O'Connor,"The Foundations of Catholic Action," ibid., 135-38.

[71] Mrs. George N. Fell, "Women's Role in Catholic Activities," ibid., 83.

Within the N.C.W.C., however, there were staff members who did not view the formation of a united Catholic front as the most important function of organizations or the soundest application to the United States of papal teachings. Most strategically located was Father Ray McGowan, who had long advocated constructive social reform as the most effective antidote to the poison of Communism. In contrast to the emphasis on episcopal direction spelled out in official guides, he argued that the Church must rely on the laity who could use special "technical, commercial, and social competence" to help apply Christian principles to social problems.[75] Far more suited to the United States than authoritarian clericalism would be an enlargement of lay initiative in the administration of policies and in the work of self education.[76]

---

[72] Ibid.

[73] Paul F. Tanner, "Milwaukee's First Catholic Action Conference," Catholic Action, XIX (July, 1937), 11.

[74] [Tanner], "The Story of the Conference," in Conferences in Catholic Action, 6.

Whenever he wrote or spoke on lay organizations, McGowan stressed the development of a general program of training in Catholic thought to guide laymen in essentially autonombus action. Highly trained laymen and lay women would join priests in furnishing the material for the program of education and for the actual re-creation of the social order. Like John A. Ryan, his superior, McGowan believed that Catholics should remake social institutions by gaining positions of power in business organizations and civil life. Characteristic American traditions, he insisted, required "secular economic organizations and secular political parties."[77] Laymen and lay women should apply moral principles "in the light of their knowledge of economic and governmental life and within the possibilities of the various situations." Some laymen were members of labor unions and employer's associations, and some were "in the heat of political life." Upon them rested the best hope for social regeneration.[78]

---

[75] R.A. McGowan, Toward Social Justice: A Discussion and Application of Pius XI's "Reconstructing the Social Order" (New York, n.d.), 81.

[76] R.A. McGowan, "Catholic Action," Outline XII: Aids for Study Clubs on Pius XI's "Reconstructing the Social Order" (Washington, mimeograph, n.d.), 12; O'Brien, 184.

[77] McGowan, "Catholic Action," 12.

McGowan viewed lay religious organizations as instruments of social education. Since there was little possibility of "Christian" economic organizations and political parties in the United States, their primary function was to foster "education in economic morality." More interested in developing programs that would impart a "complete and correct" training in social principles, he was more flexible regarding the work that went "beyond the program of education." Prior to the episcopal statement of 1936, he stated that lay organizations could help lead public opinion by taking "positions for and against certain proposals or happenings," or by working for and against them "...in the forum of public opinion, before legislative committees and in other ways." In their action, however, they should put in the forefront "things that are directly derivable from the moral principles of the great platforms of Catholic social teachings." The great danger in the work of lay organizations and of priests was that they might seek and make central some panacea for social problems. Should this occur, he noted, "the lay organization's program of education is turned away from the principles and program to follow a will-o'-the-wisp." The farther the action removed itself from direct applications of the moral principles, the less effective was its program.[79]

---

[78] McGowan, Toward Social Justice, 82.

In his approach to "Catholic Action" as the guide and motive power for social reconstruction, McGowan projected an image of independent lay action which his "vast program of lay education" in fact denied. In its moral and religious aspects priests would head up, encourage, and guide social education in lay organizations. Since lay organizations participated in the mission of the Church, their members must carefully hew to a line between independence and autonomy.[80] In order that the program be carried through effectively, organizations should be federated in dioceses and throughout the nation. Special committees to which a priest would be assigned should be "set up to engineer the program." In their task of guiding and stimulating the work of self-education, however, the priests should not dominate.

---

[79] Ibid., 83, 85, 86-87.

[80] Ibid, 85. In his brief treatment of "Catholic Action," David J. O'Brien refers, 184, to the "stress on education and independent (italics mine) action" of the leaders of the N.C.W.C. Social Action Department. This emphasis, he notes, was "particularly attractive to an increasing number of laymen distressed by the poverty and injustice of their society and anxious to involve themselves in its alleviation." However, McGowan clearly and explicitly denied independent action. In Toward Social Justice, 84, he states, rather, that "the lay organizations are autonomous but not independent...."

McGowan insisted that "the lay organization, Catholic Action, in the Councils of Men and Women, is itself autonomous."[81] In its tone, McGowan's plan laid more emphasis on the autonomous character of Catholic Action than did statements which reflected more rigorously a theme of episcopal control. This he did because of his basic distinction between "the morals...and the economics of economic life."[82]

Despite this subtle difference from the position taken by members of the N.C.W.C. Administrative Board, McGowan's approach called for a "unified and joint drive to make the program reach every element in economic life."[83] By equating "official Catholic Action" with the National Councils of Men and Women, McGowan underlined his acceptance of formal, institutional means and compounded a confusion about the status of those Councils which N.C.W.C. publications encouraged. McGowan argued that the "ideal way" to conduct a program of social education in a unified manner was in connection with "formally organizaed Catholic Action" reaching into parishes and city-wide organizations.[84] Such an approach necessitated cooperation with the Councils, which provided "the means for a general program of training...

---

[81] Ibid., 85. See McGowan, "Catholic Action," 12..

[82] McGowan, Toward Social Justice, 81.

[83] Ibid., 88.

[84] Ibid, 87-88.

that will reach everyone."[85] In a modified expression of his view, McGowan admitted that the Councils functioned on a "voluntary basis" but consistently viewed them as corresponding to the Italian model.[86] Convinced that none of the vast number of lay organizations in the United States had the sole purpose of continuously training their members, McGowan suggested that "the logic of American conditions" called for an "organization of existing organizations" so that all of them could "be led jointly" to give their members "the needed training." In his view, this was the program laid down by the bishops in their formation of the National Catholic Welfare Conference.[87]

In common with the bishops, McGowan used the term "Catholic Action" in an ambiguous and misleading fashion. In the United States there was no organization that bore that title. In Italy, the phrase *Azione Cattolica* had a dual referent. Its primary object was the organization itself, but the term also referred to its goal and purpose: the lay apostolate. McGowan transposed the second meaning and applied it in such a fashion as to suggest the existence of the first, namely, a federated and united lay organization directly commissioned to collaborate

---

[85] *Ibid.*, 84.

[86] McGowan, "Catholic Action," 12.

[87] McGowan, *Toward Social Justice*, 83.

XUM

with the hierarchical apostolate. Beyond its grammatical awkwardness, the suggestion that an organization, "Catholic Action" in the singular, was realized in federated organizations, was incorrect. Itself a voluntary organization with no canonical jurisdiction, the N.C.W.C. did not and could not give to the Department of Lay Organization the "mandate" which, according to papal doctrine, was one essential characteristic of "Catholic Action."[88] In no way could the bishop's conference limit the jurisdiction of a local ordinary. Thus, other movements seeking to further the mission of the Church could achieve equal status within a diocese if their leaders managed to secure an episcopal mandate. Only by a confused, imprecise use of terminology could N.C.W.C. spokesmen claim that the Councils were "official Catholic Action in the United States." Despite continuous intimation to the contrary, the bishops' statement on "Catholic Action" and "Catholic Activity" conveyed no such recognition. Nor did the constricted focus of the episcopal pronouncements eliminate the possibility that individual Catholics might significantly diverge from "official" plans and maintain "unofficial" movements as a source for continuing initiatives.[89]

---

[88] See William Ferree, S.M., Introduction to Catholic Action (rev. ed.; "Youth Series No. 8;" Washington [1942]), 62-63, for a brief statement of the importance of the "mandate" in Catholic Action.

[89] See Daniel Callahan, The Mind of the Catholic Layman (New York, 1963), 87, for the distinction between "official" and "unofficial" organizations.

XUM

When the bishops attempted to convey the impression that the N.C.W.C. played the central role in an organized program of action, they bypassed the critical social and theological issues raised in Europe and in the United States. Required to maintain elements of lay autonomy, they could not prevent independent lay action. Even in their unhappiness with the political activities of Father Coughlin, they were unable to do anything as long as his immediate superior, who alone could exercise disciplinary authority, gave his support. In their effort to interpose ecclesiastical authority, the bishops could sketch the framework for a program of unified Catholic action, but they had no firm basis to carry through their expressed intentions. In a conflict between old and new forms of organization, the American bishops thought in terms of the Conference which they had erected and which they had but recently reorganized.[90] Yet their relative incapacity to act as an organized body remained.

The bishops could threaten to "disavow" any group which did not follow proper procedure, but that sanction was ineffective. Perhaps the most significant example of episcopal inability to develop a "Catholic position" on important national issues was in regard to the Spanish Civil War. Despite determined effort, nearly two-thirds of America's Catholics failed to follow their leaders' efforts to demonstrate the rectitude of Franco's cause and the wickedness of his opponents.[91] In the campaign to press what the bishops saw as "common Catholic interests," it seemed that the American faithful were "dismally incapable of unified action for a worthy objective."[92]

---

[90] See The National Catholic Welfare Conference: Its Organization, Departments and Functions (Washington, 1935), 22-23, for the reorganization of the N.C.W.C.

Insistence on union with the mind of Christ did not provide a firm basis for preventing separate efforts that sometimes worked at cross purposes. In his study of Catholic social thought during the thirties, David J. O'Brien found that Reconstructing the Social Order "offered no firm basis for constructing a unified program of Catholic social action."[93] In a further conclusion, he observed that "in a society that emphasized freedom and initiative the Catholic laity were bound to reject clerical domination.[94] It seems clear that the elasticity of principles obstructed all efforts to develop a unified approach. Elucidation of lofty principle did not counteract the vested interests of N.C.W.C. staff personnel, nor did it formulate answers to crucial questions. Who stood in a position to repudiate the action of lay Catholics who desired to participate in the apostolate? In the absence of heterodoxy, who could draw a clear line between independence and autonomy? In what fashion could the flowering of societies with different purposes, in no way coordinated, be prevented? Who would design the program that best contributed to the welfare of Church and society? Who could prevent the development of alternative viewpoints on the best manner of organizing the activity of laymen?

---

[91] J. David Valaik, "Catholics, Neutrality, and the Spanish Embargo, 1937-1939," The Journal of American History, LIV (June, 1967), 85.

[92] Ibid., quoting "Merwin Hart on Spain," Ave Maria, XLVIII (December 17, 1938), 793.

[93] O'Brien, 183.

[94] Ibid., 184.

Those who deemed it unfortunate that the organizational process undertaken in the immediate aftermath of World War I was incomplete sometimes missed the fact that the purposes of lay organizations were as wide as those of the Church and as narrow as the special perspective of important leaders. The belief that Catholic principles could guide men in every problem of life rested on the premise that practical action and innovation must flow deductively from Catholic truth rather than from an experiential reaction to life which suggested needs and problems to which must be attached an immediate priority of concern. Moreover, the focus on education, organizational regularity, and episcopal direction pointed to a theory that leadership corresponded naturally and directly with authority. In starkest terms, however, such a theory would deny to socially concerned priests and laymen the unregulated right to initiate movements which could battle for the attention and

XUM

participation of coreligionists. In a period of social dislocation such a claim was impossible to maintain.

In particular, the belief that elements of conflict and disunity could be muted by direct reference to the implications of authoritative statements by the Sovereign Pontiff was a two-edged sword. Laymen who initiated ventures of direct action to solve the problems of industrialism, labor, and race relations were clearly working in directions outlined in papal encyclicals. There was no possibility of repudiating such activities. Those affiliated with the N.C.W.C. who saw the program of the bishops as the only possible way of ensuring the proper kind of unity misperceived social realities and, in a partial sense, substituted for the unity springing from the shared life in Christ's Mystical Body elements of organizational machinery. Not surprisingly, those who saw a great social crisis were unprepared to direct their efforts to this task. As the bishops took steps to develop organization from the parish to the national level, other Catholics moved to create new movements. While the central question of who would lead Catholic efforts for social regeneration remained unsettled, reform-minded priests, together with lay followers, worked to develop a new cutting edge of socio-religious leadership.

XUM

CHAPTER TWO .

CLUBS, CONFERENCES, AND CELLS

In their eagerness to help rout depression and to restore sound economic relations, Catholic social leaders did not feel obliged to devise new plans, only to revive and amplify earlier formulations of social justice.[1] Analysts were concerned that with unemployment continuing, the birth control movement reducing the rate of growth of the Catholic population, and communists infiltrating the new industrial unions, the Church's hold on her membership would be jeopardized unless a large measure of social justice could be speedily secured. The social liberals measured their program against the background of militant communism and the development of a virile labor movement and called for labor colleges and schools of economics as essential means to furnish an intelligent solution to the problems of industry and agriculture. If the broken social order was to be rebuilt, they reasoned, the number of properly instructed Catholics must be vastly augmented; and schools, press, and seminaries must fortify themselves with a clear

---

[1] See Abell, American Catholicism and Social Action, 42-81.

XUM

knowledge of economics and ethics, examine their interrelationships, and thus promote a deep understanding of the Labor encyclicals and their applications.[2] The real problem of social action in America was not clerical indifference but lay apathy, particularly that displayed by Catholic union members.

Leaders joined in broad agreement that the Church should identify itself with the labor movement. One offshoot of the Catholic Worker movement was the formation of the Association of Catholic Trade Unionists. Another was the multiplication of social action groups throughout the country.[3] In Washington, John A. Ryan and Ray McGowan planned the schools for clergy which Bishop Edvin O'Hara had promoted. Through its broad program of activities, the N.C.W.C. worked for the enlightenment of the Catholic population on the great needs of the day in education, decency in movies and literature, and above all, social and economic justice. In May, 1937, its

---

[2] *Ibid.*, 258. See Richard Deverall, "John Brophy Speaks," *Christian Front*, II (September, 1937), 225-26.

[3] See Daniel Callahan, *The Mind of the Catholic Layman* (New York, 1963), 88. For the Association of Catholic Trade Unionists, see Aaron T. Abell, ed., *American Catholic Thought on Social Questions* (Indianapolis, 1968), 408-14; Abell, *American Catholicism and Social Action*, 26-63; Betten, 169-192; Philip Taft, "The Association of Catholic Trade Unionists," *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, II (January, 1949), 210-18; George R. Donahue, "The History of the A.C.T.U.," *Proceedings, Second National Catholic Social Action Congress* (Cleveland, 1939), 370-71; Sebastian Erbacher, O.F.M., "Do We Need an Association of Catholic Trade Unionists?", *ibid.*, 371-77; and Raymond S. Clancy, "The Detroit Archdiocesan Labor Institute," *ibid.*, 491-95.

XUM

Study Club Committee returned to the topic of social reconstruction, asking "How shall Catholics know well the right moral principles and spread them?"[4] The clear answer was that

> We shall all be unified in our religious program and our work under the Bishops. We shall join a Catholic lay organization working with and under the Church. We shall get it to start, or we shall join, a program of training. We shall take part in study clubs and industrial conferences....[5]

Through deeper study American Catholics must ~~at~~ least attempt "to make up for lost time and by a desperate burst of energy to acquire at least a talking knowledge of the social question."[6] Only those who were properly informed could hope to speak and act effectively.

In their effort to foster action for social justice, few Catholic leaders paid attention to the possibility of developing movements modelled on European Jocism. Founded in Brussels, Belgium in 1925 by Canon Joseph Cardijn, this movement and its satellite organizations had spread rapidly throughout northwestern Europe and had received special commendation from the Holy Father. In a long interview with Canon Cardijn, Pius XI had approved the Jeunesse Ouvrière Chrétienne and urged the priest to spread the movement all over the world.[7] In addressing J.O.C. pilgrims in Rome in 1929, the pope declared that they had perfectly interpreted his definition of "Catholic Action." Six years later, on the occasion of their tenth anniversary, he held the organization "the model for all Catholic Action."[8]

---

[4] "May Study Topic: Pope Pius XI on Reconstructing the Social Order," Catholic Action, XIX (May, 1937), 23.

[5] Ibid.

[6] Frederick P. Kenkel, "The Social Question to the Fore," Centrall-Blatt and Social Justice, XXXII (February, 1940), 348-49.

The distinctive feature of the J.O.C. and of its associated movements was its insistence that the only living and progressive solution to the problem of industrial and social crisis was specialization according to different social groupings. Young workers, for example, would solve the problems in their milieu "through themselves, by themselves, for themselves."[9] The French and Belgian hierarchy had accepted this specialized focus. In Belgium, an episcopal commission reported that work for social regeneration "can only normally be done by homogeneous groups which exclude all except those of the same position or function in society."[10] In France, where the J.O.C. had expanded to over a thousand groups with a membership of sixty thousand, older adult groups adopted

---

[7] See Canon Joseph Cardijn, The Official Manual of Jocism, trans. William Kennedy (San Francisco, 1943), 13-14.

[8] Rev. Stephen Anderl, "Papal Teaching Concerning Catholic Action," The Lay Apostolate and the Priest (South Bend, 1947), 50.

[9] Rev. John Fitzsimons, "Catholic Action in Belgium," in John Fitzsimons and Paul McGuire, ed., Restoring All Things: A Guide to Catholic Action (New York, 1938), 139.

[10] Ibid., 139, quoting the August, 1927 conclusions of a "commission for coordination" the Belgian hierarchy established.

XUM

the same methods. By June, 1937 their movement of employers and businessmen, the L.O.C., was officially recognized by Cardinal Lienart, Bishop of Lille. From an original group of six young working men, the movements had grown to include hundreds of thousands of members whose publications reached a total of over 5,000,000 copies.[11]

In both France and Belgium specialization in distinct milieux had come from the initiative of groups preoccupied with the social question and developing outside of the framework of national coordinating agencies. One effect had been to take from the study circles of the national Catholic associations some of their best members. So many clergy had been attracted to the new movement in Belgium that the hierarchy had reorganized the A.C.J.B. (Catholic Association of Belgian Youth). The specialized groups were incorporated in the broader associations but left autonomous in the application of their methods. In a letter of approval, Pius XI confirmed the principles and the reorganization involved by depicting the organization as "both general and specialized."[12] The new pattern, he observed, was wisely arranged because "while establishing the parochial association as the constitutive and vital group...you leave a just liberty for the recruiting of homogeneous groups which will adapt themselves to the needs of life and their different milieux."[13] In France also the evolution towards specialization was hastened by the advent of the J.O.C. As a consequence, the Federal Council of the A.C.J.F. (Catholic Association of French Youth) amended their statutes to ensure "by grouping young men belonging to different social milieu and organized in specialized movements corresponding to each milieu the collaboration of all classes with a view to re-establishing the Christian social order."[14] The growth of the movement was demonstrated spectacularly in the Paris Congress of the J.O.C. in 1937 when seventy-thousand members from across Europe filled the stadium. Six cardinals and forty-three bishops expressed their acceptance of the movement and of its method by blessing the young apostles and commending their program.[15]

---

[11] Cardijn, 15. In 1928 the *Jeunesse Étudiante Catholique* was established in Belgium, and in the same year the *Jeunesse Indépendante Catholique* was born, together with the *Jeunesse Agricole Chrétienne*. In 1929 Catholic university students in Belgium formed the *Jeunesse Universitaire Catholique*. In France, the *Jeunesse Ouvrière Chrétienne* began in 1926, and in 1929 began the J.A.C. and J.E.C. The *Jeunesse Ouvrière Feminique* began in 1927, followed by the J.A.C.F. (Agricole) in 1933 and the J.I.C.F. (Indépendante) in 1935. The adult group, *Ligue Ouvrière Chrétienne* began in 1931 and was recognized as "Catholic Action" in 1937. See Fitzsimons, *ibid.*, 127-164 and Fitzsimons, "Catholic Action in France," *Restoring All Things*, 165-197.

---

[12] Fitzsimons, "Catholic Action in Belgium,", 141, who quotes from a letter of Pius XI to the president of the Catholic Association of Belgian youth.

[13] Ibid, 140.

[14] From the first article of the Statutes of the A.C.J.F. as adopted on January 30th, 1938, as reproduced in Fitzsimons, "Catholic Action in France," 180.

In the United States, no movement had received such direct encouragement. In their effort to coordinate Catholic activities, the American hierarchy moved in a fashion quite different from their counterpart in Belgium and France. Instead of accepting the development of specialized groups, the American bishops had promoted a common technique, i.e., the study club. In such clubs the laity would find an indispensable means of learning the correct principles. Through this means priests could counteract both ignorance and apathy and thus promote the social as well as the spiritual gospel of Christ. Whenever priests gathered to discuss means of promoting a Christian social order, they almost invariably approached the question by aiming at a better system of study clubs through which laity could learn the Church's social teaching and, hopefully, apply it in daily life.

This emphasis received strong encouragement at the Summer School of Social Action held at St. Francis Seminary in Milwaukee from July 5-30, 1937. Under the direction of such recognized experts on social doctrine as Ryan, Rev. Wilfrid Parsons, S.J., editor of America, Rev. Francis J. Haas, Edwin V. O'Hara, chairman of the Social

---

[15] Donald J. Kanaly, "The J.O.C.," in Summer School of Social Action for Priests (Mundelein, Illinois, 1938), IV, 425. See also Donald J. Kanaly, "70,000 Apostles Come to Paris," Homiletic and Pastoral Review, XXXVIII (October, 1937), 42-45.

Action Department, and Robert E. Lucey, bishop of Amarillo, Texas, priests made a thorough analysis of *Reconstructing the Social Order*. Additionally, they considered the development of diocesan programs of social education.[16] O'Hara pointed out that the only way lay Catholics could serve as "soldiers of Christ" was "to be able to say a word in His behalf." If they were inactive and silent in the face of the world, they were far removed "from the Catholic conception of the Mystical Body of Christ." Priests could conteract this deficiency by the use of either "Program" or "Discussion" Study Clubs.[17] O'Hara urged the priest students to learn what had been done in Study Clubs in previous years and then to "put that knowledge into practice." They should keep up with the new ideas that came out but remember that "simplified practice is the thing. Arrange everything and have them go to work. Groups have not the qualifications to plan, but if everything is planned out for them, ordinarily, they will do a good job."[18] Other participants argued

---

[16] See *Summary of Lectures, Summer School of Social Action for the Clergy Conducted at St. Francis Seminary, St. Francis, Wisconsin, July 5-30, 1937* (Milwaukee, 1937), I, 36-37, 53-54.

[17] In a "Program Study Club" each member was assigned a topic on which he would read a paper and about which a moderator would comment. A "Discussion Study Club" was a cooperative enterprise among eight to ten people who gathered in an informal way and did not listen to a lecture. See Bishop O'Hara, "Study Clubs," in *ibid*., 67-68; and McGowan, *Toward Social Justice*, 86-87.

[18] O'Hara, 67.

XUM

that literature portraying the terrible conditions of labor should be secured and presented to lay people through such clubs. "We must search for a means of presenting Catholic philosophy to our Catholic lay people," explained Father Joseph Hurst. "Every priest must be convinced of the necessity of the training of the people of his parish for leaders. The reason for Study Clubs is ignorance--the lack of knowledge on the part of our Catholic people."[19] Although few laymen could be expected to lecture, preach, or write about their religion, Hurst insisted that each had the obligation to answer intelligently the questions of their neighbors and fellow workers.[20] In each parish, therefore, the pastor should find some interested person and make him the chairman of parish study clubs.

The Social Action Schools were first conducted that summer also in Toledo, San Francisco and Los Angeles. Their attendance, when combined with that at Milwaukee, totaled nearly three hundred priests from twenty-four dioceses.[21] In some measure, the students were prepared to initiate, as Pius XI had enjoined, an apostolate of working men to working men. In the Association of Catholic Trade Unionists they had a lay association which sponsored night schools for workers and provided courses in the ethics of labor relations, in labor law, labor history, parliamentary law, and union procedures. The teaching and administrative personnel of such labor schools came from men and women in close touch with the Catholic Worker movement, the National Conference of Catholic Charities, and various departments of the N.C.W.C. Since nearly all social actionists deplored the weakness of unionism, the aim was to give a Christian direction to the campaigns to organize working people.[22]

---

[19] Rev. Joseph Hurst, "Study Clubs," ibid., 53.

[20] O'Hara, 67.

[21] McGowan, "Clergy Hails Schools of Social Action," Catholic Action, XIX (August, 1937), 16-17.

Only a few priests had sufficient experience and background to grasp the connection between the specialized approach of the European movements and the promotion of a program of social education in the United States. One such individual was Reynold Hillenbrand, rector of St. Mary of the Lake Seminary in Mundelein, Illinois.

The Milwaukee summer school helped inspire Hillenbrand to develop a team of priests interested in liturgy, social action, and the lay apostolate and to assist laymen in formulating a new socio-religious movement. In his study of Reconstructing the Social Order, Hillenbrand became fascinated with the papal insistence that there must be a specialized apostolate--workers to workers, students to students, young to young. Though neither the speakers nor the prescribed readings made specific reference to European Jocism, Hillenbrand's own experiences provided a connection. While doing graduate study in Rome at the French-speaking Canadian College, Hillenbrand had heard J.O.C. chaplains tell of the stirring events in France and Belgium. During his vacation the previous summer he had travelled to New York, where he visited with Dorothy Day, and then to Montreal, where he visited the Jocist Centrale to inquire about the theory and mode of operation of their movement. His participation in the Milwaukee school was the catalyst. It introduced him to the new program of the Social Action Department and prompted him to set out to make the Midwest the center of creative thinking on the place of the Church in society and the effective utilization of the laity in its apostolate to the world.[23]

---

[22] Abell, American Catholicism and Social Action, 261-62.

Hillenbrand soon emerged as a forceful, influential leader of social action among Chicago priests. Following the suggestion of Raymond McGowan, he embarked upon an effort to spell out the gospel as providing an answer to the problem of persistent depression, unemployment, the denial of labor's right to organize, and the threat of Communist infiltration of the burgeoning labor movement. At St. Mary of the Lake, he organized discussion

---

[23] Interview with Msgr. Reynold Hillenbrand, June 10, 1970; and Callahan, 88.

XUM

groups among the deacons aimed at instilling what he regarded as the correct interpretation of papal social teaching. He developed discussion outlines based upon the new series of pamphlets on social action issued by the N.C.W.C. Later, he began to teach special Saturday evening classes in economics and social principles to the seminarians. "They know so little of the social action of the Church," he explained to a prospective lecturer, "that anything you would tell them would be of great interest and profit."[24] Hillenbrand also reached beyond the confines of the seminary to nearby parishes. For some time he had felt concern about the charge that priests neither suffered the worst effects of depression nor did much to alleviate them. John Hayes, a fellow student at the Milwaukee school, had earlier suggested that someone press the reorganization of monthly priests' meetings. Notifying the Quigley Preparatory Seminary professor that "we ought to start as soon as we can," Hillenbrand organized a discussion group for priests interested in the labor problem and started a labor school at Our Mother of God parish in Waukegan, Illinois. In collaboration with Father Hayes, he presented a series of sermons at Chicago's Holy Name Cathedral on the labor

---

[24] Reynold Hillenbrand to Msgr. Francis J. Haas, January 21, 1938, Papers of Msgr. Reynold Hillenbrand (Sacred Heart Parish, Hubbard Woods, Illinois). This collection is soon to be given to the University of Notre Dame, where it will be added to the papers of the Young Christian Workers, the Young Christian Students, and the Christian Family Movement which the Notre Dame Archives now hold.

XUM

question. He joined with Hayes in providing moral assistance to the CIO organizers in the Chicago stockyards and encouraged seminarians to make effective use of their vacations by assisting the Catholic workers in their house of hospitality on Blue Island Avenue.[25]

In these efforts Hillenbrand emulated the work which "labor priests" were carrying on across the country. In New York, the Rev. Dr. John P. Monaghan gathered about him as assistants a score of the diocesan and regular clergy to promote Christian unionism. In Pittsburgh, labor priests Charles Owen Rice and Carl P. Hensler formed the Catholic Radical Alliance, aiming to reverse the process of mechanization in the steel industry and to deal with the "chaotic conditions" in the soft coal industry. In Brooklyn, William J. Smith, S.J., established the Crown Heights School for Catholic Workmen. In Baltimore and Washington over one hundred and sixty priests participated in local social action schools. In his new post as dean of the School of Social Sciences at the Catholic University of America, Rev. Francis J. Haas commuted regularly to Brooklyn and Manhattan to conduct seminars on the encyclicals for interested priests. All these clerics agreed that, though the immediate apostles of the industrial and commercial world should themselves be employers, merchants and laborers, priests must know labor problems, become better acquainted with working men, and make more effective use of their knowledge of social and economic matters.[26] In January, 1938, Hillenbrand expressed to Haas his hopes for an expansion in the number of study sessions the following summer. Shortly thereafter, McGowan urged a "Chicago school if at all possible...."[27] The staff at the Social Action Department, he noted, "certainly want one in the Middle West, and Chicago would be by far the best location."

---

[25] For confirmation of Hillenbrand's activities, concerns, and emergence as a forceful social action leader, see "Spiritual Notes, 1936," John Hayes to Reynold Hillenbrand, June 25, 1936; Hillenbrand to "Caro Fratello [Frederick Hillenbrand], August 26, 1937; Hillenbrand to Hayes, October 7, 1937: "Waukegan Labor School Notes," Hillenbrand papers. See also Dennis Geaney, O.S.A., "The Chicago Story," _Chicago Studies: An Archdiocesan Review_, II (Winter, 1963), 290; and Andrew M. Greeley, _The Catholic Experience: An Interpretation of the History of American Catholicism_ (New York, 1967), 249-250, who recognizes Hillenbrand as the most important person in developing what he terms "the Chicago liberal movement," and as "a giant who exercised tremendous influence on the seminarians, the young priests, and the laity of Chicago." For the work of Father John Hayes, see "CIO Organizer Pays Us a Visit," _Chicago Catholic Worker_, I (July, 1938), 1, 3; "Dorothy Day Writes," _ibid_, I (September, 1938), 1; and "To Catholic Unionists," _ibid_., I (October, 1938), 1. For the Lenten series of sermons, see John Hayes, "Work of the Priest: Sermons, Lecture Groups, Labor Schools," _Summer School of Social Action for Priests_ (Mundelein, Illinois, 1938), IV, 503.

---

[26] See Abell, American Catholicism and Social Action, 261; Rev. Carl P. Hensler, "Christian Principles Applied to the Steel Industry," Proceedings, First National Catholic Social Action Conference (Milwaukee, 1938), 274-280; Rev. Charles Owen Rice, "Christian Principles Applied to the Steel Industry," Proceedings, Second National Catholic Social Action Congress (Cleveland, 1939), 435-440; Carl B. Hensler, "Christian Democracy in the Soft Coal Industry," ibid., 230-36; Richard Deverall, "Catholic Radical Alliance," Christian Front, II (October, 1937), 141-43; Charles Owen Rice, "A Priest on Labor," ibid, III (September, 1938), 105-06; William J. Smith, S.J., The Catholic Labor School (New York, 1941), passim; Smith, "Labor Schools and Study Clubs," Proceedings, Second National Catholic Social Action Congress (Cleveland, 1939), 495-97; Rev. Paul E. Meyer, "Priests' Schools and Priests' Study Clubs of Social Action," ibid, 485; Rev. John P. Monaghan, "Labor Schools for the Laity," ibid., 488-89; and Francis J. Haas to Hillenbrand, February 8, 1938, Hillenbrand papers.

McGowan was also at work on the program for a National Catholic Social Action Conference, held in Milwaukee from May 1-4, 1938. Not for ten years had there been a national congress on industrial problems, and McGowan hoped that this one would show the deep gulf between an ideal society and the present conditions in the United States. To its sponsors, it represented a climax to the nineteen years of effort which had followed publication of the Bishops' Program of Social Reconstruction and a beginning to the task of developing a Christian Social Order from existing American institutions.[28] "The gaps should be made clear," McGowan wrote Hillenbrand, "gaps in organization itself, gaps in the living wage, in fair prices, gaps in the other standards." He hoped thus "to get the whole story of Catholic social teaching across--objectively and clearly...."[29]

The Conference provided a platform for the enunciation of Catholic social concerns. In his sermon at the

---

[27] McGowan to Hillenbrand, March 11, 1938, Hillenbrand papers.

[28] See, for example, Raymond Miller, C.S.S.R., "Summary of the Conference," Proceedings, First National Catholic Social Action Conference (Milwaukee, 1938), 367.

[29] McGowan to Hillenbrand, March 21, 1938, Hillenbrand papers.

XUM

opening Pontifical Mass, Archbishop Samuel Stritch stressed the Church's role in fixing the moral principles to which free social and economic behavior must conform and in stating "these principles in the terms of contemporary social and economic practice."[30] At the first mass meeting, John T. McNicholas, Archbishop of Cincinnati, sketched current social problems. Poverty, cold, hunger, and unemployment, he explained, were giving men little or no opportunity to work for their salvation and were thus "embittering them, poisoning their minds and hearts, turning them against religion, and making dangerous radicals of many who could be useful members of society."[31] Francis J. Haas explained how the authoritative rules of Christian social teaching were to be realized in the establishment of a Christian Social Order. He defined this as a

> system in which the people, accepting the obligations of social charity in Jesus Christ, organize themselves democratically by industries and by professions, and act through their respective industries or professions functioning both severally and jointly with the protection and guidance of government, to establish justice and the common good.[32]

When society was organized on those lines, he added, the totalitarian state could secure no foothold, the people's civil and economic freedom would be assured, and their economic system would be able to produce goods and services in sufficient abundance for all. The high purpose of this national conference, Haas concluded, was to understand what was taking place, to examine and face realities, to be willing to accept new ideas, and to bestir themselves in behalf of man and society.[33]

---

[30] Samuel A. Stritch, D.D., "Religion and Economic Life," Proceedings, First National Catholic Social Action Conference, 11.

[31] John T. McNicholas, O.P., D.D., "The Apostolate of Pius XI in Social Action," ibid., 25.

[32] Francis J. Haas, "A Christian Social Order," ibid., 35-36.

Other speakers took less technical approaches in touching upon the relationship between Catholic principles and American society. The papal program, argued Edward Mooney, chairman of the N.C.W.C. Administrative Committee, "not only presents a real American opportunity...[but] represents our only opportunity to save the things for which we love America."[34] Joseph Corrigan, rector of the Catholic University of America, pointed up the Catholic opportunity by reviewing the nation's history. In the seventeenth century, he explained, colonists had harmonized individual advantage and social good. "The state of the country today is so far removed from the intentions of its founders," he declared, that the first step of "the Church of Christ in this Republic...must be to re-Americanize America."[35] An industrialized people huddled together in cities were predominantly Catholics. In the task of "building civilization in this country," therefore, Catholic citizens had "a right and a duty to be most active in shaping the program."[36] A world in torment was not looking for vague principles, Mooney added; men could find the answer to their quest in the social encyclicals.[37]

---

[33] Ibid., 40-41.

[34] Edward Mooney, D.D., "An American Opportunity," Proceedings, 399.

[35] Joseph M. Corrigan, "The American Tradition," ibid., 387.

In sectional meetings and group discussions, speakers described the organization of the principal American industries and indicated the extent of their conformity with Christian principles. They called for more social legislation, a living wage for workers sufficient to maintain a family in dignity, and regulation of the unfettered competition that made a mockery of the Christian law of love.[38] These sessions, declared John A. Ryan, pointed toward "a program of action, of immediate action" through relief of unemployment and the fundamental reorganization of America's industrial society. "Every thoughtful student of contemporary economic life recognizes this situation," said Ryan. "Only the persons who do not know, or do not think, or the fatuous worshipers of what they call the 'American system,' shut their eyes to the necessity of a fundamental reconstruction." He called for the country to turn to a large program of spending, to eliminate the unbalance between productive capacity and purchasing power, and to keep the industrial pump primed. Congress should reenact the NIRA, reestablish the NRA, and promote a "little NRA" in every state. "If efforts to establish a better economic order are unsuccessful," Ryan concluded, "the main cause of the failure will be a very ugly and very ancient vice. It is the vice that we call avarice or greed."[39]

---

[36] Ibid.

[37] Mooney, 398-99.

[38] See Miller, 366-372.

Those most closely associated with the N.C.W.C. saw this first national conference not only as a way of exploring social principles and of examining economic maladjustments but as an opportunity to present their new plans of organization. Archbishop Mooney explained that the bishops of the United States who founded the N.C.W.C. had in mind as one of their prime objectives the contribution which American Catholics could make to the establishment of a Christian social order in the country. That purpose was manifest or latent in the work of all departments and was "explicit and exclusive in the work of the Social Action Department" and in its desire "to keep in close touch with the two nationwide federations of...women and...men...as vehicles for the diffusion of Catholic social principles and agencies for their application to American life."[40] Edward Heffron, executive director of the National Council of Catholic Men, explained that his organization was "preparing at this time to authorize a new program of organization and a new program of activities."[41] He stressed the papal call for organized lay action and predicted that if the National Council of Catholic Men succeeded in "building sound, vital diocesan councils" as they hoped to do, it could then develop a "system of uniform, diocesan-wide programs of study," designed to arouse interest in the social question. All that the men's federation had accomplished, Heffron noted, was "as nothing...compared to what we could do...if our organization program succeeds."[42] Closely-knit and well organized diocesan councils, he argued, could make effective use of "all the varieties of propaganda...which go to make up the corporate social apostolate."[43]

---

[39] John A. Ryan, "A Program for Recovery and Reform," Proceedings, 380, 382-83.

[40] Mooney, 398.

It fell to Edwin V. O'Hara, episcopal spokesman for the Social Action Department, to outline publicly what it had recently undertaken and what new steps its

---

[41] Edward J. Heffron, "The National Council of Catholic Men and a Christian Social Order," Proceedings, 362.

[42] Ibid., 364, 362-63.

[43] Ibid., 364. Heffron indicated that he used the word "propaganda" in "the original sense of that word," and he explained that this was a central element in Catholic Action. As examples of "the socio-economic works of Catholic Action," he mentioned "speeches, newspaper stories, magazine articles, radio programs, direct mail circularization, pamphlet circularization, handbill distribution, and so forth...."

XUM

directors deemed necessary. In his address on "Catholic Action and Social Action," O'Hara first sketched the principles basic to the development of a Christian and democratic social order and declared that the American bishops, eighteen of whom were present, were charged with the responsibility of translating these principles into action. They had already taken the first step, that of enrolling the clergy to study social conditions in the previous summer's "social action schools." Reviewing these and the work of clergy study groups in Chicago, Cincinnati, Pittsburgh, New York and Brooklyn, O'Hara called for the establishment of "a Social Action Committee of clergy in each diocese," whose members would carry out "the plans and wishes" of the local bishop. The next step would be to recruit and train hundreds of zealous laymen through local "social action conferences." Thousands of study groups would thus come into existence, he believed, and tens of thousands of intelligent men and women would become acquainted with both Christian principles and social needs. From these study groups would come the participants for "annual diocesan social action conferences," which he hoped would give new momentum to the efforts carried on for many years by the industrial conferences.[44]

Formal discussion concerning such endeavors took

---

[44] Edwin V. O'Hara, D.D., "Catholic Action and Social Action," Proceedings, 385.

XUM

place in the Priests' Meeting, which assembled on Wednesday, May 4, rather than in the general sessions of the Conference. The man most committed to a new program was Raymond McGowan, the moving force behind this gathering.[45] His agenda for that meeting did, in fact, contain an element of newness, even though it relied on the Catholic Conference on Industrial Problems which McGowan had organized fifteen years before. Although he encouraged the priests "to trace their own line of conduct" from "the principles outlined during the Conference," their principal contribution was to ratify the suggestions McGowan and his Washington staff had formulated.[46] They agreed to prepare themselves for social action ministry through individual reading, study clubs, conferences and schools. They also undertook to guide the laity through sermons, lectures, and the promotion of "labor colleges."[47] And they promised in their work with the labor movement to make friends of officials, show a sympathy to unionism, attend labor meetings regularly, speak at organizing meetings, and prepare themselves to mediate and arbitrate industrial disputes.[48]

---

[45] See McGowan to Hillenbrand, April 4, 1938, Hillenbrand papers.

[46] See "Summary of the Priest's Meeting," Proceedings, 402-08, for the suggestions prepared by the N.C.W.C. Social Action Department.

[47] This type of a labor school was really a more elaborate study club which started the evening with encyclical material, took up points in parliamentary law, and finally led to a class discussion and vote on a current labor problem. See "Summary of the Priest's Meeting," 404.

McGowan envisioned a renewal of the C.C.I.P. through the development of new local affiliates, and participants in the Priests' Meeting voted acceptance of the plan.[49] In every diocese there was to be a "Priests' Committee," which should be formally commissioned or at least approved by the Ordinary. Secondly, a group of laymen concerned for Catholic social teaching should work with these committees. Clerics who had attended the national conference, studied in a social action school, or otherwise prepared themselves for the work would be eligible for the priests' committees. They were to meet regularly and, through cooperative action and planning, promote the theme of the first national conference by working closely with the Social Action Department.[50]

McGowan's plan for lay participation affirmed the traditional emphasis on coordination of action and social education. He hoped that sixty priests' committees could be formed within the year, and he pointed out that local units of the C.C.I.P. should also be formed. That organization, he noted, was a "lay-clerical body working under the Social Action Department" which had from the beginning "adhered to the Encyclicals and the theme of the Milwaukee meeting."[51] It could, therefore, serve well to recruit lay men and women committed to the encyclicals to work with the priests' committees. Its members, however, "should be selected carefully" by the preists who could, as needed, go outside the local membership of the Industrial Conference.[52] In collaborative programs, the committees and the local units of the Industrial Conference, of which priests were also members, could hold diocesan social action conferences similar to the Milwaukee meeting, assist regional meetings of the C.C.I.P., and help get speakers and attendance at future national conferences. They could also work with diocesan councils of Catholic men and women or, where no such federations existed, work directly with general lay organizations to help them develop and conduct programs of education and activity in Catholic social teaching.[53]

---

[48] "Summary of the Priests' Meeting," 405. See also Abell, American Catholicism and Social Action, 259-260, where he quotes Charles J. Cooke, "Don't Quote Me," Christian Front, IV (June, 1939), 84, to the effect that the relatively high proportion of bishops and priests attending this conference and that held in Cleveland the following year "gave the lie to the Communists that the hierarchy and clergy are reactionary."

[49] See "Summary of the Priests' Meeting," 408.

[50] *Ibid.*, 407.

Only in the quantitative rather than the

---

[51] Ibid., 407-08.

[52] Ibid., 408.

[53] Ibid.

XUM

qualitative dimension was there anything new in the Milwaukee conference. When the priests approved McGowan's program for social reform, they adhered closely to the spirit of the episcopal statement on "Catholic Action" issued eighteen months earlier. Whether or not they were fully conscious of the fact, they thus affirmed an approach to organizing the social apostolate which McGowan had elaborated years earlier.[54] Few American clerics were in a position to question McGowan's stature as a commentator on papal thought, and the entire setting of the Priest's Meeting militated against any critical examination of his proposals. Indeed, the entire Social Action Conference reflected the episcopal preference for general organization rather than specialization of activity or personnel. Clearly, the participants did not consider the idea that homogeneous groups of similar social function should form the units of action, despite the fact that European bishops and theorists were moving in that direction. At least forty speakers at the Milwaukee meeting had appeared on past programs of the

---

[54] See McGowan, Toward Social Justice, 78-92; and "Memorandum on Meetings of Priests Regarding the Encyclical," McGowan to Msgr. John J. Burke, general secretary, N.C.W.C., October 13, 1932. Papers of the Catholic Association for International Peace, Series 3A, Box 4, Folder "Washington" (Marquette Memorial Library Archives, Milwaukee, Wisconsin). In the memorandum, McGowan noted that the purpose of priests' meetings was "to get priests interested in labor problems in the light of Catholic social teaching" and "to get them to lead a program of adult education on the Encyclical [Reconstructing the Social Order] in their communities."

XUM

Catholic Conference on Industrial Problems.[55] Only one, Vincent Mooney, C.S.C., directly referred to the Jocist movement; and he commented less on its method of organization and action than on its effort to explain the Church's economic teachings. In many cases, Mooney explained, Catholic youth had been unable to counteract the pernicious influences of radical youth organizations. He thought one of the reasons was that they had "failed to accept the intellectual challenge which the industrial conference and the study club offers," and has thus remained uninformed about the fundamental principles of social justice. Once these were widely established, Mooney suggested, Catholic youth would "learn the dangers to be avoided, the problems confronting them, and the moral principles involved."[56]

Despite the urgent call for fundamental social reconstruction, speakers at the Social Action Conference assumed the basic stability of institutional relationships. They failed to consider seriously not only the issue of lay autonomy and independence but even the definition of distinct lay roles. The laity, in short, were to become sufficiently informed to practice self-government in social and economic institutions, but their contribution to religious institutions was to be subject to the direction of ecclesiastics.[57] The clergy were to pick and train laymen, whose duty would then be to help them promote social reconstruction through means which avoided "going off at tangents" and followed the lines charted by the Pontiff. McGowan's plans for social reform, for instance, depended on three concepts: clerical selection, safety, and assistance. Selectivity safeguarded Church doctrine and channeled lay action into pathways which protected its interests. Similarly, Mooney's plan for youth work appeared less concerned with

---

[55] See "Summary of the Priests' Meeting," 407.

[56] Vincent Mooney, C.S.C., "The Contribution of Catholic Youth Organizations to the Betterment of the Economic Status of Youth," Proceedings, 105, 106-07. It was, of course, not coincidental that Mooney specifically mentioned "industrial conference" and "study club." See supra, p. 43, ll. 3-10.

---

[57] One reason for this was the importance which Church leaders attached to the battle against Communism. Betten, 3-4, notes, for instance, that throughout the crucial period of the 1930's the Church in America attempted to act as a restraining force on the American labor movement, not in order to keep it conservative but anti-communist. George Q. Flynn observes, 204, that by 1936 "it appeared that the Church was in the midst of a crusade against communism." McGowan, in Building the Social Order Again: An Annotated Summary of the Encyclical of Pope Pius XI on The Reconstruction of the Social Order (Detroit, 1939), 38, n. 175, argued that "it is clear that unless we build a social order and a governmental practice which will establish the social justice of steady employment and a good living for all, Communism, Nazism and wars will engulf peoples." Another reason was the basic theory of Catholic Action. James D. Loeffler, S.J., in "The Basis of Catholic Action," America, LI (July 7, 1934), 294, had earlier noted that "in all approved Catholic organizations, the function of the laity is not so much directive in the order of theory as executive in the order of practice." This conception of the function of the laity remained dominant for many years; indeed, it is probably the dominant clerical viewpoint today. See J.B. Schuyler, "The Role of the Laity in the Catholic Church," American Catholic Sociological Review, XX (Winter, 1959), 290-307.

XUM

practical action than with the development of "sanctuaries" which could safeguard Catholics from radical influences. The primary motive of the youth programs and organization he promoted was to draw young people closer to the Church. Heffron's announcement of a new program of activities explicitly noted that "those of us who aspire to some place in the program of Catholic Action...must be prepared to offer our services to the bishops in accomplishing the task."[58] Successful implementation of these plans meant directing lay action to Church as well as social needs.

If McGowan perceived that his program of social education clouded important issues and only imperfectly resolved long-standing tensions, he gave no immediate evidence of that fact in the plans he and Hillenbrand were laying for the Chicago School of Social Action for Priests. Shortly after the Social Action Conference he wrote to Hillenbrand proposing that during the fourth week of the school "there ought to be something about the functioning of the Priests' Social Action Committee that was discussed at the Milwaukee Priests' Meeting," so as to introduce to other priest-students the essential features of the plan.[59] Apparently Cardinal Mundelein had first envisioned such a school only for the priests

---

[58] Heffron, 363.

[59] McGowan to Hillenbrand, May 24, 1938, Hillenbrand papers.

XUM

of his diocese. More importantly, he did not think of it in terms of an N.C.W.C. project but as one he was sponsoring at his own seminary. Hillenbrand and McGowan had earlier agreed that having only Chicago priests as teachers was out of the question unless the school were to be very restricted and poor. They succeeded in keeping from Mundelein the fact that the school was actually an N.C.W.C. venture by handling all planning and publicity from Hillenbrand's end and by studiously avoiding any reference to the national secretariat.[60]

Lay Catholics working to afford some measure of relief to victims of the Depression welcomed the public announcement of the Chicago summer school. John Cogley, editor and publisher of the newly established Chicago Catholic Worker, declared the training session an answer to the accusation that the clergy were not interested in the worker. "These priests have given their lives to the solution of the worker's problem," Cogley noted, and were "prepared to throw their weight on the side of the unemployed, the underpaid, and the disorganized...." They would for a solid month wrestle "with the causes and accompaniments of depression and with the means of routing them." Under the direction of the best interpreters of the Holy Father, they would "try to find a way out; to plot that way so surely and clearly that they will be able to do something about it."[61] Like others in the Catholic Worker movement, Cogley felt a strong sense of antipathy for much that passed for Catholic life in the United States. Among such laymen, there was often a feeling of annoyance in the face of indifference or suspicion among conservative clergy. Their basic complaint was that the clergy often ignored papal social thought and progressive trends which represented an attempt to make Catholicism relevant to the age.[62]

---

[60] See Hillenbrand to McGowan, April 18, 1938 and May 14, 1938, ibid., for Mundelein's view.

As a supporter of the Catholic Workers, Rev. John Hayes shared their rejection of popular devotionalism, social conservatism, and excessive attachment to middle-class values. In his remarks on the priest's work, therefore, he struck hard at such clerical traits. Noting that many priests and lay Catholics regarded the efforts priests made in social action as novel, foolish, and positively harmful, Hayes declared that merely "academic interest" in social questions was "not enough for the main body of the clergy." It would leave them "subject to the accusation of hypocrisy or stupidity or both." The Holy Father had made it clear that priests and laity must organize themselves for a social apostolate. "Any priest who is not hopelessly inert," he challenged, "should feel himself goaded to some sort of action. The

---

[61] [John Cogley], "The Clergy Go Back to School," _Chicago Catholic Worker_, I (July, 1938), 1, 4.

[62] See Callahan, 90.

XUM

question is, What?"[63] His query went to the very heart of the issues which the Milwaukee Conference had passed over.

To this central question Bishop Edvin O'Hara gave the common episcopal answer. He reaffirmed that priests could not be content with a "purely passive" laity but must use study clubs "as a device" for reaching "large numbers" and inspiring them to take their "important place" in the work of the apostolic hierarchy. He acknowledged that reaching the laity was no small problem, but insisted that throughout the Catholic world "interest in study clubs has grown from year to year." The laity, he explained, "are to help spread the Gospel" and the study clubs were a means to that end.[64] The Chicago school went well beyond this limited emphasis. For the first three weeks it adhered closely to the N.C.W.C. format, concerning itself like earlier schools more with the progress of Catholic social theory than of Christian social action. Lectures and discussions dealt with the principles of economic morality, the desirable form of an organized social order, and the social legislation needed to bring that order into being.[65]

---

[63] John Hayes, "Work of the Priest," Summer School of Social Action for Priests (Mundelein, Illinois, 1938), IV, 498.

[64] Edwin O'Hara, "Work of the Priest: Study Clubs," ibid., 444.

[65] For the format of the social action schools, see Abell, American Catholicism and Social Action, 260; and "Summer School of Social Action for Priests," Hillenbrand papers.

A local priest, Bernard Burns of Oak Park, Illinois, insisted that although organization and legislation might be excellent helps in obtaining a living wage and a better distribution of the world's wealth, only a return to the true social spirit would effect stability in all social institutions. He invited priests to consider the relationship between social action and the Church's liturgy. Pius XI's encyclicals rang with such words as "organic" and "organism," Burns noted, and taught that social and economic reform must be joined to a renewal of Christian life. Therefore, Burns urged, "the corporate nature of Christian worship must be emphasized" as had not been done for hundreds of years. Men must once more realize "the real meaning of membership in the Mystical Body of Christ." Liturgy was directly involved in social action because man's action in Christ's Body was corporate and "his activities must be a fellowship in action." Christianity promised a new humanity and the beginning of a new and entirely different world. Because this truth was so often slighted and because of the continuing exploitation of men as impersonal units within society, Burns took issue with the prevailing drift of N.C.W.C. proposals. In particular, he claimed that "it is neither fair nor just to dismiss the personalist movement with a wave of the hand as being 'fine but inadequate.'" Its philosophy was valid, he insisted and suggested to the priests that "for communal personalism--not communist personalism" they should "follow carefully the significant movement begun by Dorothy Day and Peter Maurin."[66]

In a stirring speech, Father Donald Kanaly of Oklahoma, recently ordained in Belgium after completing studies at the University of Louvain, took direct issue with the study club as a means of social action. His speech was the first occasion when a significant number of American priests learned of the J.O.C.'s practical application of the papal teachings to the priest's social ministry. Kanaly told of Canon Cardijn's effort to form apostles among the workers in Belgium, arguing that unless the Church could "form apostles among the workers" in the United States it would "never get them back." Workers alone were able to win back other workers, he said, and "only action will ever make apostles." In study groups laymen might "think beautifully," but they did not know "how to act" when they got among Communists "because they are led [and] because Communists know how to act." The J.O.C. "could save America from Communism."[67]

Not only did Kanaly introduce the priests to the J.O.C., but he explained in detail its "inquiry method," consisting of three steps: "observe - judge - act." That technique, he insisted, was "the very soul of the whole organization" and was "quite different from that of an ordinary study club." In Jocism, contrary to other organizations, the whole stress was "on action" and on making laymen "do it themselves." He asked his listeners to picture what "a group like this could do in America" spreading from diocese to diocese. "There is nothing like the J.O.C.," Kanaly concluded. Existing Catholic organizations dealt only with "a corner" of life, with the young worker's recreation perhaps, or his intellectual formation. But there was no organization which treated every problem besides the J.O.C. In recognition of the European experience and of the American emphasis, he suggested that "the J.O.C. will not come from the top, it must grow up from the bottom." He urged priests to promote its growth by developing "cells" of workers capable of leadership and influence. Priests could gradually get members of the "cells" to seek information and take action to Christianize their environment. "The whole drive," he explained, "is to prepare them to go into the trade unions to be apostles." Although the organization itself was not a union, the European experience suggested that from the J.O.C. would come leaders capable of pointing trade unions toward Christian ideals.[68] Kanaly's preference for specialized groups over study clubs and industrial conferences made

---

[66] Bernard Burns, "Work of the Priest: Social Action and the Liturgy," in Summer School, 525-26, 531.

[67] Donald J. Kanaly, "The J.O.C.,"ibid., 424, 426, 427.

---

[68] *Ibid.*, 426, 427.

XUM

the "cell technique" the central instrument of social action.

Kanaly did not realize how propitious was the timing of his appeal. In part, it distracted priests from McGowan's program to make the Catholic Conference on Industrial Problems the center of the social action picture. Furthermore, it came when many churchmen were seeking ways to go beyond the technique of forming clubs and holding conferences. In San Francisco, Archbishop John Mitty had, at the behest of Guiseppe Cardinal Pizzardo, called the men of his diocese to engage in "Catholic Action" and had officially organized them along new lines.[69] In Brooklyn, four graduates of a Catholic high school joined Father Paul Ward, C.S.P., in forming cells in Brooklyn and Glendale, Queens, and in publishing as the American Jocists a monthly, The Crusader.[70] The Knights of Columbus were completing their two year "Crusade Against Communism" and were preparing to launch a new "Crusade for Social Justice."[71] At a time, then, when O'Hara and McGowan were promoting diocesan conferences and parish study clubs, other Catholics were emphasizing action programs.

---

[69] Interview with Louis Putz, C.S.C., July 8, 1968. See also John J. Hunt, Catholic Action: The Church in Action (San Francisco, 1939), passim; "The First U.S. Archdiocesan Program of Catholic Action," Catholic Action, XXII (November, 1940), 28-29; and Mrs. Raymond Zotti, "Composition Book," [37], Papers of Mrs. Mary Irene Zotti (Oak Park, Illinois). These papers are soon to be donated to the University of Notre Dame and will be added to those of Reynold Hillenbrand, the Young Christian Workers, the Young Christian Students, and the Christian Family Movement. In her notes on the initial San Francisco efforts, Zotti observes that Cardinal Pizzardo was "opposed to Cardijn" and wanted San Francisco to start "Italian-type Catholic Action." Archbishop Mitty thereupon secured the assistance of three bankers whom he commissioned to teach Catholic Action and to direct the reorganization of men's activities.

[70] See Gerald and Margaret Fitzgerald to Rev. Francis B. Donnelly, September 6, 1963, Zotti papers. Fitzgerald,

From these disparate lines, priests could and did take what they felt to be the most satisfactory approach to the social apostolate. Because of his close contact with the Social Action Department, his scholarship, and his leadership capacity, Hillenbrand emerged in the early fall as the cleric in the Archdiocese of Chicago best suited to organize activities designed to spread knowledge of the social gospel.

To extend the interest in social action generated by the summer school, Hillenbrand invited any interested priest in the archdiocese to prepare one of a series of

---

together with Joseph Bryant, Vincent Ferrari, and Frank McGlinchy, met with Father Ward to find an appropriate form of Catholic Action and established the two cells after a search of available literature from the United States, Canada, and Belgium. The movement was loosely attached to the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine in the Brooklyn Diocese, whose Msgr. Francis X. Fitzgibbon acted as a moderator. Fifteen cells eventually came into existence, sponsoring early Jocist publications which included The Crusader, The Militant, The American Jocist, Leaders' Bulletin, Catholic Action Bulletin, and Bibliography of Periodical Jocist Literature. See also Catholic Action Library, "Reviews of Current Thought on Catholic Action, Part IV: Catholic Action Groups in the United States," Catholic Action, XXV (April, 1943), 10.

[71] See the messages from the Supreme Commander of the Knights of Columbus in the issues of Columbia magazine for the purposes, plans, and operations of these two crusades.

twenty-five lectures to be delivered weekly at the Holy Name Cathedral beginning in November and continuing into the spring.[72] He also urged pastors in all areas of the diocese to start a parish labor school. Its simple procedure, he pointed out, consisted of one period each week subdivided into classes on the doctrine of the encyclicals, labor history and problems, parliamentary law and public speaking.[73] To each pastor he promised to supply priests if no curate in the rectory was free to conduct the course. The value of such a school, he suggested, was that "it would help the working people a good deal."[74] In addition, Hillenbrand reconvened the Cathedral priests' study group as an attempt "to crystallize the doctrine in our minds" and organized new priests' groups on the North, West, and South Side of Chicago.[75]

---

[72] See mimeographed letter of Hillenbrand to "Dear Father:" October, 1938, Hillenbrand papers.

[73] Hillenbrand to William I. Ward, Pastor, St. Rose Church, Chicago, Illinois, October 7, 1938, *ibid*. Copies of numerous letters to other pastors asking for such schools are also available.

[74] *Ibid*.

[75] Mimeographed Hillenbrand memorandum of October 10, 1938, proposing priests' study groups, Hillenbrand papers. In this work he collaborated with Fathers Donald Runkle, William Dorney, and Lewis McMahon. So vigorous were Hillenbrand's promotional activities that Raymond McGowan in his new summary of Pius XI's *Reconstructing the Social Order* specifically listed him as one of the eighteen priests who were founding organizations of working people for mutual help. See McGowan, *Building the Social Order Again*, 5.

In these standard programs for priests and adults, Hillenbrand encountered little difficulty, but he needed assistance in what he viewed as a desirable promotion of specialized youth groups of "Catholic Action." He wrote to Kanaly to note that the latter's talk at the summer school had aroused such interest that a few priests wanted to get the J.O.C. underway. Two had written to England to obtain information but had received no response. "They are completely stymied," he noted, for "no one who is interested reads French comfortably enough to do anything with the literature from Belgium." The diocese was ripe for action "if only the priests knew how to go about it." Further, a good beginning in Chicago, the second industrial city of the country, might get the J.O.C. "off to a good start." Would it be possible, he asked, for Kanaly to put something into English by way of translation? There was a crying need for such literature, and Hillenbrand was "at a loss what next to suggest to these priests."[76]

In Ponca City, Oklahoma Kanaly had already organized a cell of workers. In his reply to Hillenbrand's request, he noted that the effort would "be difficult and dangerous" for "few priests here feel this is a priest's work." The most important phase was the early formation of a "little parish cell" but most priests seemed

---

[76] Hillenbrand to Kanaly, November 17, 1938, Hillenbrand papers.

XUM

interested in the cell only "after they have some notion of the whole machine and its grandiose possibilities."[77] Such skepticism was not a regional phenomenon. During the summer, Richard L.G. Deverall, coeditor of the Christian Front, had travelled widely on the Eastern seaboard, discussing with numerous parish priests and chancery officials the possibility that Catholic youth in America could be brought to such a point that they would have "the spirit of the Jocist lads." Later he told Paul Hanley Furfey at Catholic University of the reaction which this suggestion invariably elicited from most priests, namely, that "It might work in France, but never here."[78] The midwestern interest in this approach, however, was confirmed not only by the work of the Chicago priests but by the action of Father James O'Toole in beginning at DeSales College, Toledo, Ohio, a cell of college students as a first step toward a specialized movement in that milieu.[79]

The episcopal preference, however, was still for a general organization and the study club as technique. In their annual meeting, the bishops dissolved their

---

[77] Undated reply of Kanaly to Hillenbrand's letter of November 17, 1938, ibid.

[78] Richard L.G. Deverall to Paul Hanly Furfey, October 18, 1938, Papers of Paul Hanly Furfey (Bureau of Social Reserach, Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C.).

[79] See Sister Mary Herman, S.S.N.D., History of the Toledo Y.C.S. Movement (Toledo, 1955), 1, Zotti papers.

Committee on Scouting and established a new Committee for Youth, instructing it to develop with the Administrative Board a plan for the establishment of a Youth Council. Archbishop Mooney suggested that Archbishops Cantwell and Beckman and Bishop Sheil undertake the planning as a subcommittee. Their emphasis became clear when, while discussing the suitability of various names for the new organization, Bishop Sheil rejected the word "movement" as possibly indicating an undisciplined and unorganized effort rather than an organization. The bishops and archbishops thereupon accepted Archbishop Mooney's advocacy of the name National Catholic Youth Council as a federation to unify existing organizations of youth.[80]

The pattern of events, it seems, was quite clear. Throughout 1937 and 1938, bishops and clerics closely associated with the N.C.W.C. stressed the importance of influencing the direction of the labor movement by making bold new efforts to train Catholics in their Church's social teaching. In harmony with their past programs, they devoted most attention to the development of study clubs and industrial conferences to disseminate those papal principles which they regarded as the definitive analysis of social needs. By early winter, 1938, however, a movement was growing which looked less to Rome than to northwestern Europe for a design for social action. As in Europe, these first ventures grew out of individual efforts that involved little if any direct relationship to the national secretariat. Such organizing ventures depended not so much on disenchantment with the N.C.W.C. as on the conviction that study clubs, long the focus of attention, represented an inadequate response to the pressing urgency of social ills. The American hierarchy maintained their emphasis on general organization as a means of promoting united action and, with a few exceptions, directed their major energies toward social education as preparatory to orderly social action. Those few who favored what later came to be designated as "formation through action" stressed less the machinery of nationwide federation than the corporate action of specialized groups whose bond of union was the grace of Christ. In this pattern were latent elements of conflict, which later erupted into vigorous debate.

---

[80] From minutes of the general meeting of bishops, October 14, 1938, as reproduced in "Charter of the Youth Department (from the Minutes of Administrative Board Meetings)," Hillenbrand papers. Paul Tanner, in "The History of the Catholic Youth Council," Proceedings, Second National Conference on Catholic Youth Work (Washington, 1949), 29, notes that "as early as October 4, 1938 the fruits of...pioneering study were reflected in a minute of the Administrative Board, N.C.W.C. of that date, recommending the creation of a National Catholic Youth Council." See also "History of Youth Department, National Catholic Youth Conference," ibid., 6, which explains that "in 1938, Bishops of the United States, in their annual meeting, formally approved the creation of the Council." The original minutes of the bishops' meeting are closed to scholars until 1988.

CHAPTER THREE

SPECIALIZED CATHOLIC ACTION, 1938-1940

Increased Catholic concern with social tensions led by late 1938 to two distinct efforts to organize Catholic youth. In the first case, American bishops who desired to eliminate confusion in youth work initiated plans to develop a united Catholic front.[1] In the second, a small band of priests, spearheaded originally by Father Donald Kanaly, worked to develop cells of young lay "militants" who accepted their responsibility to spread Christ's Kingdom and made "underground preparation for the Christian Revolution."[2] Resting on a conceptual structure which affirmed unity and harmony as prerequisites for Catholicity, the one pointed to federated councils as the desirable basis, while the other fostered the formation of "cells" dedicated to a socio-religious crusade "to restore

---

[1] See "Charter of the Youth Department," passim., Hillenbrand papers. See Mrs. Eugene McCarthy, "The Function of Lay Organizations in Relation to Catholic Social Teaching," Proceedings, Second National Catholic Social Action Congress (Cleveland, 1939), 504-08, for a good example of the emphasis on the formation of a united Catholic front.

[2] "Let Us Work Together," The Cells, [organ of the cell movement in Toledo], II (April, 1940), 4. Copies of the publication are in Box 109, Folder 1, Papers of the Young Christian Students (University of Notre Dame Archives).

XUM

all things to Christ."[3] Representing the N.C.W.C.'s coordinative purposes, the first was official; the other in its attempt to bring to the United States the essence of the Jocist movement, was entirely unofficial.[4] Behind each approach stood European precedent: the former relied on Italian models and the latter on the method of French and Belgian movements. Neither of these two expressions of social concern attracted as much public attention as the defense of France's cause, but they had important consequences for the development of Catholic lay identity and action.

Strangely enough, the Knights of Columbus, a long established fraternal organization and frequent collaborator with the N.C.W.C., supplied an important catalyst to the promotion of Jocism. In November, 1938, the Knights announced that during the early part of the following year Paul McGuire, Australian journalist and author, would deliver under their sponsorship a series of lectures on the plan, the objective, and the achievements of Catholic Action.[5] Available evidence suggests that the Knights expected McGuire's lectures to support the "Crusade for Social Justice" carried on in the columns of their publication Columbia, and to help them secure repeal of the arms embargo on Spain.[6] In the eyes of more progressive Catholics, the Knights' program soon "became ridiculous" since the fraternal order not only lacked "any intentions of serious and continued sacrifices" but "didn't even know such were involved in Catholic Action."[7] The more immediate effect of the lectures was to encourage the formation of social action cells in cities across the country. In his visits to New York, Toledo, South Bend, Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul, and San Francisco, McGuire laid before his audiences Pius XI's call for lay action. A powerful orator and propagandist whose pro-Franco sympathies were obvious, McGuire was most interested in the Jocist movement. He thus stimulated interest in the work which Kanaly, Hillenbrand, and

---

[3] In his encyclical Il Fermo Proposito, issued June 11, 1905, Pope St. Pius X stated that "Catholic Action sets before itself the restoration of all things in Christ." See F. Bennett, What Does the Pope Say About Catholic Action? (Sydney, Australia, 1937), 15. McGuire and Fitzsimons accordingly entitled their handbook on Catholic Action Restoring All Things. The cell movement in Toledo listed on the title page of The Cells the fact that it was "published in the Interest of Restoring All Things in Christ." The few extant copies of this mimeographed bulletin can be consulted in the Zotti papers, Oak Park.

[4] See Daniel Callahan, The Mind of the Catholic Layman, 87, for the distinction between official and unofficial organizations.

---

[5] "Important Announcement," Columbia, XVIII (November, 1938), 3.

[6] See "Minutes of Quarterly Meeting, August 15-18, 1938," Columbia, XVIII (October, 1938), 24; and John David Valaik, "Catholics, Neutrality, and the Spanish Embargo, 1937-1939," The Journal of American History, LIV (June, 1967), 77-79. See issues of Columbia from 1938 through 1939 for the "Crusade for Social Justice" launched by the Knights.

[7] John Hayes to Mary Irene Caplice, February 14, 1941, Zotti papers.

O'Toole had initiated.[8]

On the day McGuire began his tour, Frank Sheed and Maisie Ward released in the United States the handbook, Restoring All Things, which he had coedited with John Fitzsimons and which made clear his approach to "Catholic Action."[9] McGuire endorsed Huxley's observation that "the social dynamic in almost all history has been the small group." Even beyond the example of the twelve apostles, he argued, there was good reason for believing that the unit of Catholic Action should be the small group, large enough "to impart some social discipline" but small enough "to preserve the individual quality of each of its members." Until such groups were actively nourishing the spiritual, intellectual, and social life of Christians, he asserted, "it would seem of little use to establish the large machinery of Catholic Action." Structure should not be mistaken for life, he claimed, any more than one would mistake a skeleton for a living body. "Dead bones" could be made to move without "vital being." Therefore, "Catholic Action" should spring from small groups studying as their initial concern the environment in which members lived and worked, using "the method," he put it, "though perhaps with some adaptation, of the Jocist Enquiry." Observing that such an approach related study to action and to real needs, McGuire simply explained, "To observe, to judge, to act: these are the processes of effective work."[10]

---

[8] Interviews with Louis Putz, C.S.C., July 8, 1968, with Burnett Bauer, December 17, 1968, with Edward Marciniak, June 9, 1970, with Reynold Hillenbrand, June 10, 1970; and with Mrs. Mary Irene Zotti, October 3, 1970. See also "The History of the YCW St. Boniface Section," Report on San Francisco, California, prepared by the St. Boniface Section of the Young Christian Workers of San Francisco for the International Y.C.W. Study Week held from June 23, 1947 to June 29, 1947 at Montreal, Canada (typescript, 1947), 10, Papers of the Young Christian Workers (in the possession of Reynold Hillenbrand, Hubbard Woods, Illinois). The early papers pertaining to the organization which became the Young Christian Workers, covering the years 1938-1950, are now housed with the Hillenbrand papers and will soon be added to the organization's papers from 1950-1968 now held at the University of Notre Dame.

[9] See A.J. Schweitzer to Hillenbrand, February 3, 1939, Hillenbrand papers.

McGuire's propaganda campaign for what came to be termed "specialized Catholic Action" left an indelible mark upon the few specialized groups in existence. In Toledo, Ohio, Father O'Toole's original group of DeSales College students soon had an adjunct at nearby Mary Manse College, and high school cells began to operate at Ursuline and Notre Dame Academies and Central Catholic High School. These groups began publishing in March their own bulletin, The Cells.[11] In San Francisco, where Paul Meinecke, O.F.M., worked to carry out Archbishop Mitty's mandate to set in motion the machinery of Catholic Action, students soon discovered McGuire's articles and formed, on March 1, 1939, the first cell of the San Francisco

---

[10] Paul McGuire, "Formation Technique," in McGuire and Fitzsimons, ed., Restoring All Things: A Guide to Catholic Action (New York, 1938), 198, 200, 202, 208, 209.

[11] See "Checking Up," The Cells, II (April, 1940), 6.

J.O.C.[12] In Chicago particularly, McGuire's appearance provided a stimulus to action. Shortly after his first lecture, Father James Keane, O.S.M., pastor of Our Lady of Sorrows Basilica, began a Catholic Action School. There McGuire and his wife explained to hundreds the Jocist technique, organized a central Catholic Action council, and formed over twenty groups.[13] Father John Hayes had already begun at Chicago Teachers' College a cell of leaders, who quickly became members of the central council and worked with the Servite priests. Hillenbrand invited McGuire to speak to the seminarians, and the priests working with him formed an informal, voluntary committee to provide "ample clerical support" so that "more Catholic Action groups of this type" could develop as diocesan clergy became "better acquainted with the program."[14] In a mass Catholic Action meeting sponsored by Keane, McGuire spoke to an estimated twenty thousand Catholics and urged them to "show the Mystical Body of Christ in action."[15]

---

[12] See "History of the Y.C.W. St. Boniface Section," 10, Y.C.W. papers. McGuire's articles were a great stimulus to priests and lay leaders who were interested in specialized Catholic Action. The most important were "Preparation for Catholic Action," Sign, XVIII (October, 1938), 140-43; "The Method of Catholic Action," Columbia, XVIII (January, 1939), 3, 18; "The State of the Church Under Pius XI," Columbia, XVIII (April, 1939), 9, 22; "Pope of Catholic Action," Sign, XVIII (April, 1939), 548-550; "The Catholic Opportunity in Modern America," Columvia, XIX (August, 1939), 7, 17; "March of Catholic Action," Columbia, XIX (October, 1939), 10, 18; and "Group in Catholic Action," Sign, XX (September, 1940), 93-95.

[13] Martin Paul, "Novenites At It Again! Launch Catholic Action Movement," Chicago Catholic Worker, II (June, 1939), 3; writer's interview with Edward Marciniak, June 9, 1970; with Reynold Hillenbrand, June 10, 1970; and with Mrs. Mary Caplice Zotti, October 3, 1970.

[14] See "Report of Priests' Meeting at St. Angela's on May 31, 1939," 1, Hillenbrand papers.

Behind the scenes Hillenbrand worked to steer Chicago programs away from mass appeals toward direct concentration on students and workers. The work at Our Lady of Sorrows didn't interest him too much because it represented "a hodge-podge of groups."[16] He favored McGuire's emphases on changing the environment, specialization, and social inquiry but was concerned that overly enthusiastic priests were making mistakes. In a letter to Father Hayes, Hillenbrand observed that he "didn't like the publicity about Father Keane's idea" for a public meeting. "You can't produce Jocism in mass production."[17] To get straight in his own mind the essential characteristics of Jocist formation, Hillenbrand ordered from the Liverpool Archdiocesan Board of Catholic Action six dozen copies of a pamphlet published by the Young Christian Workers there under the title, "How to Start a Section," and two dozen copies of Father Robert Kothen's pamphlet explaining "Catholic Action and the Young Christian Workers."[18] These he gave to interested priests and seminarians in order to disseminate the correct notions.[19]

---

[15] Paul, 3; writer's interview with Mrs. Mary Caplice Zotti, October 3, 1970.

[16] Interview with Reynold Hillenbrand, June 10, 1970.

[17] Hillenbrand to John Hayes, May 3, 1939, Hillenbrand papers.

Informed of McGuire's work in Chicago, Father Kanaly from Ponca City, Oklahoma addressed a circular to priests across the country. He insisted that contact must be kept between all groups and priests interested in this work. In ringing tones he proclaimed that

> The Y.C.W. (J.O.C.) is coming to America. This is in the words of Pius XI "A PROVIDENTIAL MOVEMENT"--God is bringing it to America. Already the interest is everywhere. Priests and Young Workers in every state are interested and ready to go...Paul McGuire is just concluding a special school in Chicago for priests and lay leaders preparatory to launching the Y.C.W. there...and here we have been working for the past eight months...[and have] a State Federation in Oklahoma officially recognized by the Bishop with a hundred militants and regular cell meetings in about ten cities over the state.

He was certain that "within another year" groups would be established "all over America," and that this would bring on a crisis which few then could foresee.[20]

---

[18] See C.H. Haynes, Assistant Secretary, Liverpool Archdiocesan Board of Catholic Action, to Hillenbrand, April 19, 1939, *ibid*.

[19] Interview with Reynold Hillenbrand, June 10, 1970. It is necessary to note the importance that Hillenbrand attached to the necessity of "correct ideas" or "correct notions." For his use of these phrases, see Hillenbrand to Francis J. Haas, January 21, 1938, Hillenbrand papers. For Hillenbrand, "correct notions" meant adhering to the principles laid down by the Pope. His admirers and critics seem to agree that this was his fundamental orientation. Dennis Geaney, O.S.A., in "The Chicago Story," *Chicago Studies*, II (Winter, 1963), 290, points out that "the genius of the rector seemed to be his abiding conviction that when the pope speaks it is the voice of Christ we hear." Andrew M. Greeley, in *The Catholic Experience: An Interpretation of the History of American Catholicism* (New York, 1967), 250, suggests that Hillenbrand's use of the papal encyclicals as a blueprint for social reconstruction was simplistic and led to authoritarian leadership.

In Europe, Kanaly reported, Fathers Cardijn and Kothen were following closely the developments in America. In their letters they advised him to "strive and urge all to strive for one Y.C.W.," declaring that "you shall never have the Y.C.W. in America until you have one spirit--one name--one program--one organism." Kanaly believed anything else would be a powerless caricature. Kanaly announced that the first national meeting of priests to work out a unified direction would be held during or immediately following the Second National Catholic Social Action Congress, scheduled to assemble in Cleveland from June 12-14, 1939. In a personal note to Hillenbrand, Kanaly warned that European correspondents were correct in pinpointing the "crisis of unity" as the greatest problem of all. He urged Hillenbrand to come to the Cleveland meetings to help deal with it.[21] Kanaly himself appeared on the Congress program as "Promoter, Jocist Movement" in a forum meeting on youth,[22] apparently at the behest of Bishop Kelly of Oklahoma City,

---

[20] Undated, mimeographed letter of Father Donald J. Kanaly, Director, Oklahoma Federation, Young Christian Workers, to "Dear Father," [May, 1939], Hillenbrand papers.

[21] Kanaly to Hillenbrand, [May, 1939], ibid, in the form of penned postscript to the form letter.

[22] See National Catholic Social Action Congress, "The Congress Program" (Cleveland, 1939), 3, ibid.

XUM

who had previously served on the episcopal committee for scouting and was now a member of the committee planning for youth work.[23]

Already involved in plans for his second summer school, Hillenbrand agreed that "unity is certainly necessary" and promised Kanaly that he would be in Cleveland, where the two could "have a long talk together." Hillenbrand also noted that the Chicago priests were starting the work. He had persuaded Father Bernard Burns that the J.O.C. was the best means through which Catholics could take action to change the social order. Burns instituted a local chapter of the ACTU and began working with the groups inspired by McGuire's presentations.[24]

The Cleveland Congress aimed to chart the means of promoting Christian democracy as a basis on which the social order could be reconstructed. Both unofficial and official lay organizations spelled out their plans and programs. Among the former were the Association of Catholic Trade Unionists, represented by George R. Donahue; the Christian Front, by Richard Deverall; and the Catholic Workers, by Dorothy Day. Among the latter were the Catholic Conference on Industrial Problems, represented by Raymond McGowan, Linna Brissette, and James A. Corcoran; the American Catholic Sociological Society, by Ralph A. Gallagher, S.J.; the National Council of Catholic Women, by Mrs. Earl Reynolds and Mrs. Eugene McCarthy; and the National Council of Catholic Men, by Edward Heffron and John G. Bowen.[25]

---

[23] See "Charter of the Youth Department," passim., ibid.

[24] Hillenbrand to D. Kanaly, June 4, 1939, ibid.

Under the direction of the Department of Lay Organizations, spokesmen for the two nationwide federations examined the function of lay organizations in relation to Catholic social thought. The representative for the women's council reiterated the argument that "organized effort is the channel through which Catholic Social Teaching can be effectively achieved."[26] As executive secretary for the men's council, Edward Heffron made public the new plan of organization that Msgr. Michael Ready, the N.C.W.C. general secretary, had formulated for Catholic men. The national office of the N.C.C.M., Heffron explained, planned to establish in Cleveland "a model organization" which could be repeated in other dioceses throughout the country. The program consisted of organizing committees to deal with each of five fields of activity, Spiritual, Youth, Charity, Study and Instruction,

---

[25] See "The Congress Program," ibid; and Proceedings, Second National Catholic Social Action Congress (Cleveland, 1939), 535-38; 501-520; 370-78.

[26] Mrs. Eugene McCarthy, "The Function of Lay Organizations in Relation to Catholic Social Teaching," Proceedings, 501. Mrs. McCarthy noted, 508, that "we are witnessing today what is perhaps the most aggressive, the most determined and the most earnest efforts on the part of our Spiritual authorities for a United Catholic Action program. There is no doubt but what the policy of our spiritual leaders today is a policy of vigorous Catholic Action and of courageous and intelligent leadership."

Defense and Extension. These committees would "pyramid up" from parish, deanery, and diocesan levels to "one central blanket organization."[27] The chairman of the session, Cleveland's Msgr. Floyd Begin, praised the program as the basis of a "complete organization program of Catholic Action."[28]

As the various speakers unfolded their organization's history and programs for future work, Hillenbrand and Kanaly met first for a lengthy dinner. Their conversation touched upon the training of lay apostles, the specialized fields in which they worked, and the importance of unity. Though he had immersed himself in the literature of England's Young Christian Workers, Hillenbrand turned to Kanaly for advice on what areas of need lay leaders should concentrate. Kanaly drew from his breviary a holy card and wrote on the back side the words "domestic," "economic," "political," and "international." They agreed, then, that specialized movements should treat every problem of social life. The two next secured Bishop O'Hara's consent to preside at a dinner meeting for priests interested in Jocism. Some thirty priests turned out, and the two explained the background of the movement and encouraged the formation of local groups. When the question of adapting foreign procedures to American settings came up, those present agreed to

---

[27] See the speech of Edward Heffron, in Proceedings, 515.

[28] See the remarks of Msgr. Floyd Begin, ibid., 512.

XUM

call student cells "Catholic Action Students" and other groups "Catholic Action Cells." The cells would adopt the emphasis of the European Jocists, even though with some exceptions that name would not be used. Kanaly concluded the meeting by recommending that priests plan to join him in promoting American participation in the J.O.C. pilgrimage to Rome in August.[29]

Upon his return to Chicago, Hillenbrand set about incorporating these objectives into the final arrangements for the two-week summer school of social action. His associate, Father John Hayes, secured on June 22 from Father Gissler, the Servite priest in charge of the Catholic Action groups, an invitation to take over with Bernard Burns the direction of half the lay leaders who prepared material for the general meetings. Hillenbrand explained in a letter to Kanaly that these two would "be able to establish the necessary centralization at the Cathedral." Burns had recently been transferred to Holy Name Cathedral, where the rector, Msgr. Joseph Morrison, was "most enthusiastic about the J.O.C." He added that

> it would be a good thing, I think, to rush through some sort of publications through the N.C.W.C. so that some contact basis of the new set up could be established by any priest interested. It would announce publicly that possibility of unity which we so much desire.

Finally, Hillenbrand pleaded with Kanaly to come to Chicago for the summer school. No one else could handle the class on Jocism, he urged, and during the evenings, which were free of any program, Kanaly "would be able to indoctrinate the priests" to his "heart's content." The newly ordained Chicago priests were "rarin' to go," he said, "and need your talk."[30]

---

[29] Interview with Reynold Hillenbrand, June 10, 1970.

Hillenbrand was not fully aware of the attitudes of the N.C.W.C., so he did not foresee the difficulty of securing its cooperation in promoting Jocism. At the Cleveland congress Richard Deverall, who was attempting to build an elitist movement of Catholic college students, had been startled to discover the negative attitude of the bishops' conference toward movements beyond its immediate control. "I did see Father Mooney and Father Ferree," he informed Msgr. Furfey, "and learned that N.C.W.C. regards you and I [sic] as 'perfectionists.' I think the remark and the criticism drips with cynicism."[31] The N.C.W.C. was in fact preoccupied with still another student Congress, that of the Pax Romana, the official International Movement of Catholic Students, which was scheduled to meet for the first time in the United States in August at Catholic University in Washington.[32]

Kanaly, then, stood virtually alone in the effort to push his campaign for American participation in the world J.O.C. pilgrimage to Rome. Undaunted, he released another circular to inform priests that Cardijn had manifested God's will in his appeal for an American presence. "To Rome! To Rome!" the Belgian exhorted. "The world Y.C.W. will be there. There we shall talk; there we shall make plans; there God will direct us. Come--in God's name. We all await America. The Holy Father expects America. There can be no world pilgrimage, no world Y.C.W. without America."[33] Although convinced that many priests needed a widened vision, Hillenbrand was not sure that the pilgrimage held immediate priority, and admonished Kanaly to consider Chicago's West Side. "The unity of this industrial city needs to be safeguarded and could hardly be sacrificed," he argued, "even in the interest, if that were possible, of national unity--or in the interest of some immediate objective like the pilgrimage to Rome. "Let us pray," he continued, "that we may do not what Kanaly or Hillenbrand would like for the moment but what God knows is best for the future."[34] Still, this project did have the advantage of drawing attention from other, less acceptable, promotional work. A recent article, for instance, Hillenbrand informed Kanaly, "made no mention of the Servites, but it did mention you as the new leader."[35]

---

[30] Hillenbrand to Kanaly, June 30, 1939, Hillenbrand papers.

[31] Richard Deverall to Paul Hanly Furfey, July 4, 1939, Furfey papers.

[32] See Norman McKenna, "Pax Romana in America," Columbia, XIX (October, 1939), 12, 17.

In Kanaly's eyes, however, the project meant much more than a tour or a voyage. "This pilgrimage marks a new age, the formation of a new youth, to build a new world, a new Christianity, a second Middle Age, more glorious--more Christianlike than all."[36] He worked from the assumption that the pilgrimage would "make the Y.C.W. in America " and would give "the formation of priests we seek, of apostles we desire."[37] His "one desire" was to speak of the Young Christian Workers, and he planned to stimulate the pilgrimage in every way he could, namely, by attending the Denver convention of the National Catholic Conference on Charities, by speaking at Msgr. Charles Rice's Pittsburgh School on Social Catholicism, and by visiting Kansas City, Chicago, Washington, and New York.[38] American "militants" would have a prominent place in the Rome program. "You can imagine, Reynold, what this will mean to the other nations and to America," Kanaly reminded Hillenbrand. The "militants" would "proclaim to the world" that the young workers of America were "going back to Christ."[39]

---

[33] Mimeographed letter of Kanaly to "Dear Father," July 5, 1939, Hillenbrand papers.

[34] Hillenbrand to Kanaly, August 2, 1939, ibid.

[35] Ibid.

In his own promotional effort, Paul McGuire suggested a somewhat different analysis of the Catholic opportunity for the country. In the formative stages of the movements, he explained, "each one of us...should remember always the needs of order, of cooperation, of collaboration, of agreement."[40] In his thirty-thousand mile tour through the United States and Canada, he was convinced that "all through the country" groups were forming to continue Christ's work in the world. These efforts, however, needed guidance; the movement must not succumb to the practical heresy of "rugged individualism." Catholic Action, above all, was "an organized apostolate." Therefore, McGuire continued, it "should grow in order." Those interested should realize the importance of directing it by careful study and by thought. Leaders in Catholic Action should constantly remind themselves that "study that does not fulfill itself in action is sterile, but action undirected by study is chaos."[41]

---

[36] Mimeographed letter of Kanaly to "Dear Father," July 5, 1939, Hillenbrand papers.

[37] Ibid.

[38] Kanaly to Hillenbrand, July 15, 1939, Hillenbrand papers.

[39] Kanaly to Hillenbrand, [July, 1939], ibid.

Kanaly's pilgrimage with twelve young workers to Rome was aborted. On the day they arrived in Paris, the international rally was cancelled because of the declaration of war. The five girls in the company were told to return, but had to wait in London for three weeks for passage. That enforced delay did have one lasting effect: they met there Ruth Darby, a vacationing teacher from San Antonio, Texas, who upon her return began forming with the Oblate Fathers in Texas "cells of restoration" and began publishing a bulletin under that name.[42] Kanaly and the young men went on to Rome, where they were received by Msgr. Montini and later had an audience with the Holy Father. Travelling throughout Italy for six weeks in an effort to book their return, the pilgrims finally made their way back to the United States in late October. Though the pilgrimage had fallen short of their expectations, Kanaly and his Oklahoma members were not discouraged. They quickly reorganized and laid plans to create a national Y.C.W. movement in America.[43]

---

[40] Paul McGuire, "The Catholic Opportunity in Modern America," Columbia, XIX (August, 1939), 17.

[41] Ibid.

Under Kanaly's guidance, the Oklahoma Jocists abandoned caution. In a circular dated December 2, 1939, Louise Hicksman, who worked full time as a national propagandist and editor, informed priests of their plan for a national constitution, gave instructions on how to start, and printed up a series of "social inquiries" to be used by all cells in the United States.[44] Already they were preparing a national monthly publication, which would carry their sample questions as aids to the distinct observations, judgments, and actions of their subscribers. Because Kanaly was stationed there, Oklahoma for the moment was their national headquarters.[45] Others who had visited Rome did not forget so soon the importance that growth come from below. Bernard Burns, who in September had visited the Central Bureau of Catholic Action in the Pallazzo San Callisto, had talked with Cardinal Pizzardo, its director, who urged youth leaders to proceed quietly if they wished to be effective. Pizzardo's remarks, Burns reported, led one to understand that "there must be no clamor, no blasting of trumpets!"[46] Like the corporate order of Catholic social thought, each cell should grow from the communication of one person to another, and then multiply itself throughout a parish. Next came "coordination of the groups in a parish" which subsequently were "coordinated *within* the diocese."[47]

---

[42] Interview with Mrs. Mary Irene Zotti, October 3, 1970; and[Al Eisenmenger], "History of the U.S. Y.C.M.," Y.C.M. Manual (Chicago, 1966), 2. In 1965 the National Council of the Young Christian Workers changed the name of their organization to "Young Christian Movement" (Y.C.M.).

[43] [Eisenmenger], 2.

[44] Mimeographed letter of Louise Hicksman to Hillenbrand, December 2, 1939, Hillenbrand papers. It is impossible to tabulate how many priests across the United States received a copy of this circular.

Kanaly's attempt to develop in Oklahoma the nucleus of a Y.C.W. movement spreading to every part of the United States followed in part this pattern but lacked effective control of the instruments of communication. Even as the Oklahomans were planning their program, Paul Tanner, director of Milwaukee's Catholic Action Secretariat, pointed to the C.Y.O. as "a youth apostolate" which was "a phase of Catholic Action" since it used the same techniques.[48] Tanner distinguished between an organization for youth and a program for youth. After the bishops approved plans for the National Catholic Youth Council, this line or argumentation became clearer. In the February 18, 1940 issue of the nationally distributed Our Sunday Visitor, Vincent Mooney, C.S.C., director of the Youth Bureau, noted that Kanaly had developed Y.C.W. groups in the Oklahoma area and was making contacts with other groups. "Considerable experimentation is being done in order to adapt the JOC idea to the American scene," he reported. "Those interested in the Young Christian Workers' movement are warned lest their enthusiasm run away with their better judgment." Mooney explained that the Y.C.W. could not be developed overnight and that "without a trained leadership capable of directing parochial units" it would be "impossible to accomplish anything worthwhile."[49]

---

[45] *Ibid.*

[46] Bernard Burns, "Catholic Action," *Christian Social Action*, V (January, 1940), 5-6.

[47] *Ibid.*, 6. (Burn's italics)

In his regular column Mooney began to serialize his free translation of Henry Roy's Un Problem et une Solution, published originally in 1934 by the Secrétariat Général of the Canadian J.O.C. As they waited for leaders in the United States to think through the whole problem, Mooney explained, his readers might find interesting what had been accomplished in Canada. Young workers in particular, he continued, could perhaps find in the methods and techniques of Canadian youth an incentive toward practical solutions of their own problems.[50] Mooney made his position much clearer four days after the Episcopal Committee on Youth decided that its subcommittee should draft by July a plan along the scheme already prepared for the coordination of youth work. In his March 10 column, Mooney introduced Roy's treatment of the Jocist hope to transform the worker's world. He emphasized that "the Jocist ideal must be adapted to meet our particular situation" and that its organization "must fit into the organizational plan of the Church in the United States." He "particularly emphasize[d]" the necessity of "proceeding cautiously before attempting to develop the Young Christian Worker idea on a local basis."[51]

---

[48] Paul Tanner, "The Foundation of a Catholic Youth Organization," Our Sunday Visitor, October 28, 1939, 4.

[49] Vincent Mooney, C.S.C., "Leads for Leaders," Our Sunday Visitor, February 18, 1940, 7.

In Toledo, Father O'Toole's cell movement quickly picked up Mooney's demand for cautious planning in the effort to adapt Jocist principles to the American setting. The Toledo leaders stressed that the movement was in an experimental stage. "We are trying this method in our city," they explained, "another city is trying that."[52] Cells were spreading to the four corners of the country, but despite peculiar local emphases, in each city militant youth were praying, studying and acting toward the same end. To Kanaly's suggestion for a National Study Week, the Toledo cells responded, "We are very interested...but let's get practical about the thing.... It would be very difficult for the leaders from all over the country to get together."[53] In their city, the editors noted, the work was with a "Cell Movement" which "intended to become an authorized Catholic Action organization."[54] O'Toole admitted that the cells were still feeling their way. Variety or tentativeness of technique were not obstacles, he argued, "provided that each militant is constantly preoccupied with the necessity of working out a technique that will be adapted to American society."[55] What the movement really needed were "national organizers, with personal experience, to help the groups who are just beginning."[56]

---

[50] Ibid.

[51] Vincent Mooney, C.S.C., "Leads for Leaders," Our Sunday Visitor, March 10, 1940, 7.

[52] "Let Us Work Together," The Cells, II (April, 1940), 4.

Neither Washington nor Toledo leaders fulfilled this need. The impulse came rather from Chicago and the University of Notre Dame, where resided the stable leaders brought together by Paul McGuire. His speaking engagement at South Bend, Indiana was especially significant. In the audience was Louis Putz, C.S.C., who had recently come to the United States after serving six years as a J.O.C. chaplain in France. Because of illness, Putz had been on the Notre Dame campus for several months with no appointment or specific duties. Shortly after McGuire's presentation, he organized among graduate students a group known as the Catholic Action Students. Originally numbering only five members, they began publishing a mimeographed paper, the Leaders' Bulletin, in which they presented social inquiries designed specifically for students. At nearly the same time, McGuire returned to Chicago for a two-day planning session, arranged by Bernard Burns, to invigorate the faltering cell movement there. Many clergymen who felt they were getting nowhere had dropped out of the priests' J.O.C. meetings which Burns headed. Additionally, he and William Cooney had made little progress in drawing group leaders away from the program led by Joseph Srill, O.S.M., at Our Lady of Sorrows Basilica. McGuire shared with Burns and Hillenbrand the view that the United States movement required more order and direction. Everywhere he went he found young people with enthusiasm. However, each group was "working far too much alone, and often, with far too

---

[53] "Flash to Ponca City," The Cells, II (April, 1940), 6.

[54] "Checking Up," The Cells, II (April, 1940), 6. The statement that they intended to become an authorized Catholic Action movement suggests that the Toledo leaders expected a mandate. See infra, 147, 183.

[55] James J. O'Toole, "Editorial," The Cells, II (April, 1940), 1.

[56] "Foreign News," The Cells, II (June, 1940), 4, quoting from a letter of Paul Meinecke, O.F.M., ecclesiastical assistant to the San Francisco Young Christian Workers.

XUM

vague an idea of where it is going."[57]

In Chicago, Hillenbrand and Putz joined forces to strengthen the cells. The two were brought together by Charles J. Marhoefer, a graduate of St. Mary of the Lake Seminary and, in early 1940, a student of physics at Notre Dame. He informed Hillenbrand that although Putz lacked Kanaly's "exalted style," he had "the same program," and was "much more definite in his details, and therefore easier to understand."[58] Chicago was starving for such a man. Marhoefer invited him to the priests' meetings, and Putz readily accepted. He came first in late May to a regular discussion session. Several weeks later he spoke to cell members, explaining that the J.O.C. was "a miracle of the twentieth century" which had "worked wonders in France," and promised much for the United States as well.[59] On July 12, 1940, the last day of Hillenbrand's Institute on Labor, he explained to priests from seven midwestern dioceses the work he was doing with college students. Hillenbrand shortly thereafter arranged to have Putz provide the basic material for the regular meetings.[60] He next made plans for a national convention of priests interested in Jocism to meet in Chicago at Holy Name Cathedral.[61]

---

[57] Paul McGuire, "Group in Catholic Action," Sign, XX (September, 1940), 93; and writer's interview with Louis Putz, C.S.C., July 8, 1968.

[58] Rev. Charles J. Marhoefer to Hillenbrand, [February, 1940], Hillenbrand papers.

[59] Frank J. McDonough, "Zeal of Youthful Catholics Miracle of 20th Century Says Priest-J.O.C. Leader," The New World, June 14, 1940, 11-12.

This decision came at a time when the delicate interplay of diocesan, regional, and national planning efforts seemed particularly confused. In Buffalo, Bishop John Duffy sponsored the first meeting of diocesan youth directors to consider ways of safeguarding the young from the pitfalls they encountered. In the same month, Bernard J. Sheil, auxiliary bishop of Chicago, met with members of the Catholic Youth Senate, an advisory body representing over a dozen youth organizations, which he had formed to direct and coordinate their work. The Senate leaders approved plans for the first Chicago Catholic Youth Congress, to be held at the C.Y.O. headquarters from October 4-6, 1940. Participants discussed the episcopal statement on "The Church and the Social Order" and expressed their views on government, civil liberties, labor and peace. Through the resolutions the Congress passed, Sheil believed, leaders in civic life would see that "we are radical in the sense that Christ was radical." Sheil also brought to the United States two Ladies of the Grail, Doctor Lydwine Van Kersbergen and Miss Joan

---

[60] See Hillenbrand to John Hayes, September 9, 1940, Hillenbrand papers.

[61] Interview with Reynold Hillenbrand, June 10, 1970. See also Hillenbrand to Sister Mary Aurelia, September 19, 1940; Hillenbrand to Rev. Jerome Drolet, September 20, 1940; and Hillenbrand to Rev. John F. Cronin, September 24, 1940, Hillenbrand papers.

Overboss, and presented to them as a center for their work Doddridge Farm, Libertyville, Illinois. As sponsor of the Grail Movement, a youth movement devoted to Catholic Action, Dr. Van Kersbergen explained that they would work with young women ready to "give their lives to this work" and willing to be trained for three years. They then would "join in the great movement of Catholic Action already underway in America."[62]

Meanwhile, the midwestern Jocist leaders took steps to further their specialized approach to Catholic Action. In July, the Toledo cells took action to organize themselves as "specialized movements in preparation for Catholic Action" by splitting into divisions for men and women and sections for students and workers.[63] O'Toole began publishing in the Catholic Chronicle a series of explanatory articles on Catholic Action, suggesting that specialization provided the solution to "the relationship between the diocesan and national directive offices and the various associations of Catholic Action."[64] In particular, the Jocist-type movements should enjoy relative independence in the recruitment and training of their members and in the assignment of their proper duties.[65] In Chicago, Srill's Catholic Action council underlined the theme of autonomous growth. Nothing but good could come from giving Sheil's conference their fullest cooperation, the editors of Action explained. "We will take as active a part in the Congress as we possibly can," they added, "and after it is over, we will resume our own program as we originally planned it, wiser for what we will have learned through the Congress."[66] On organizational matters, however, the Chicago groups expected to learn little. In early September, Mary Irene Caplice notified the Toledo cells that Chicago would organize all student and teacher cells into a new system of federations, centered at the hub of the diocese, the Cathedral, in order to establish closer contact with the Ordinary.[67]

---

[62] See "National Catholic Youth Congress," Action, I (August 5, 1940), 1; "The Grail," ibid., 3; and "Doddridge Farm--A Challenge," ibid., 1-2.

[63] "Division of Sections," The Cells, II (August, 1940), 7.

[64] See James J. O'Toole, What is Catholic Action? (New York, 1940), 46.

The Jocist convention that met in Chicago from September 24-25, 1940 was the first public conference specifically devoted to long range planning. It drew McGuire, Kanaly, Henry Roy, O.M.I., chaplain to the first approved J.O.C. organization, Vincent Mooney, and Harold Carroll, assistant general secretary to the N.C.W.C. Under McGuire's guidance, Hillenbrand's team of priests reorganized their cells on the basis of precise specialization, formed the Chicago Catholic Action Federations, and established a board of seven federation chaplains.[68] Participants discussed with McGuire the manual he planned to publish, and the organizers distributed advance copies to the priests who were working with groups in various parts of the country.[69] The Chicago priests deputed Father Martin Farrell, curate at St. Mel's parish on Chicago's West Side, to handle the details of the priests' meetings and to develop an instructional program. Cell leaders who had worked with Srill's council agreed to henceforward center their action under the guidance of the new federations.[70]

---

[65] Ibid.

[66] "Our Program," Action, I (September 4, 1940), 5.

[67] See Mary Irene Caplice to the Toledo cells, as quoted in "Foreign News," The Cells, II (September, 1940), 8-9.

In the immediate aftermath of the convention came a flurry of meetings and correspondence. Hillenbrand invited McGuire to speak to the seminarians, and they held a long discussion on the Chicago activities. Shortly thereafter, Hillenbrand wrote to John Hayes, now stationed in Washington as an assistant director of the Social Action Department, to explain that Archbishop Stritch had indicated that he would "establish Catholic

---

[68] Interview with Reynold Hillenbrand, June 10, 1970; and Hillenbrand to Martin Farrell, October 9, 1940, Hillenbrand papers.

[69] William Busch, "Discussion Clubs for the Clergy," Oratre Fratres, XV (December 29, 1940), 51.

[70] Interview with Mrs. Mary Caplice Zotti, October 3, 1970; and William Boyd to Hillenbrand, [November 14, 1940], Hillenbrand papers.

XUM

Action through the Holy Name Societies."[71] Hillenbrand had hoped that the national meeting would settle disputed points, and he still hoped that Stritch would hold off long enough so that the work among the beginning cells could get under way. Things looked promising following the meetings at the Cathedral, he explained, for the priests' meetings would operate on a more orderly basis with Putz supplying the material, while the group leaders meeting at the Cathedral would have "more definite objectives." Hayes should take advantage of his contact with Fathers Mooney and Tanner to "give them a good dose on Catholic Action."[72]

In Washington, Hayes had a different perspective on what had taken place at the convention. He wrote to Farrell to ask what the Chicago priests had done to Mooney, who had overnight seemingly emerged as an ardent supporter of specialized Catholic Action. In turn, Farrell wrote to Mary Irene Caplice, explaining that Mooney, who "came to Chicago knowing nothing about the work," had become a "rabid militant."[73] The Youth Bureau Director, he exulted, was "taking the whole thing to the bishops," would "edit the Young Worker," and "wants our contributions." He advised her to get going on an explanatory pamphlet. "The bishops' agent wants it. Write all you can; let me see it." Further, she should notify her friends that the priests and lay leaders were "really" going to do some organizing and clarifying of ideas.[74] To Hillenbrand he wrote that the new chaplains had outlined a program for the militants' meeting and were preparing to convince other priests of their program. "The federation heads are working together fine so far," Farrell indicated. "I think we got the right men."[75] Apparently this emphasis was designed to counteract Hillenbrand's caution. The seminary rector reminded Farrell that "we ought to remember that everything is unofficial and that we must invite people to do the work and to do it right." Provided that certain basic ideas were followed, Hillenbrand conceded, "I do not think there will be any difficulty if it is handled right."[76]

---

[71] Hillenbrand to John Hayes, October 3, 1940, Hillenbrand papers.

[72] Ibid.

[73] Martin Farrell to "Dear Gang," [mailed to Mary Irene Caplice], October 11, 1940, Zotti papers.

The national planning meeting had been designed to clarify methods of operation and to foster agreement on basic principles. Its more immediate effect, however, was to spark renewed effort in the Archdiocese of Chicago to develop a properly organized Catholic Action program. Many priests were ignorant of the basic principles Canon

---

[74] Ibid.

[75] Farrell to Hillenbrand, October 11, 1940, Hillenbrand papers.

[76] Hillenbrand to Farrell, October 9, 1940, ibid.

Cardijn had formulated for the specialized apostolate. If unaware of papal teachings on the subject, they often lacked experience in working with cells. As unofficial coordinator under the new plans, Farrell in early October addressed a circular to all priests serving as chaplains to Chicago cells. Reminding them that they had earlier concentrated on listening to lectures given by the experts, he stressed the urgent need that all who guided local groups discuss differences among themselves and reach basic agreement. Only then could they give the laymen who had been working in the movement the assistance they needed. Priests already active in the work of cells needed to define their conception of the militant's meeting, and to secure answers to fundamental questions. How did one transform a typical young layman into an apostle? How instill in the layman a realization of his vocation and responsibility as an apostle? What about specialization according to sex and occupation? Farrell urged all priests to attend a planning meeting at the Holy Name Cathedral Rectory on Thursday afternoon, October 17.[77] Convinced that this first postconvention meeting would be crucial, Farrell informed Hillenbrand that "if you can come next Thursday...you can help a lot. Start the meeting by giving a talk on the necessity of reform and organization; then give us a good boost. My worry is that the others might not be willing to cooperate."[78]

---

[77] Mimeographed letter of Martin Farrell to "Dear Father," October 14, 1940, ibid.

Such fears were groundless. The meeting was a success beyond expectations and Farrell moved to the next step. "You will probably agree," he told the priests, "with the general sentiment on our beginning--we have made a humble start toward success."[79] It was only a beginning, he cautioned, and without an agreement on their whole program, the priests would have "worked in vain." Therefore, they must insist that two of their militants attend all leaders' meetings, particularly the next one at the Cathedral Hall on Wednesday, October 30. "See that they understand that this meeting is very important," Farrell directed. "We now have plan and principles."[80] To Hillenbrand he confided his belief that the central organization was still very weak. "We have no power to oblige the laymen to come to meetings, to see that they have the correct technique...."[81] Their job must be to ensure that the movement did not remain weak and ineffective. Spirited criticism of their undertakings would also prevent many mistakes and ultimate failure.[82] The general meeting of lay leaders went well, and Hillenbrand immediately dispatched his congratulations to Farrell. "So much depends on the work," he stated. "Let us pray that the cells will multiply and that they will do the work as it ought to be done."[83]

---

[78] Farrell to Hillenbrand, October 14, 1940, ibid.

[79] Mimeographed letter of Martin Farrell to "Dear Father," October 23, 1940, ibid.

[80] Ibid.

[81] Farrell to Hillenbrand, October 21, 1940, Hillenbrand papers.

Hillenbrand was concerned that the lay cells might become study clubs and pursue social education in preference to action. If there was any doubt in his mind concerning the inadequacy of the club technique, it disappeared when he learned that the Australian National Secretariat of Catholic Action shared his view. In a letter to the rector, that body declared the specialized movements of "far greater importance" than discussion groups. In their experience "the Discussion Group Movement" tended "of its very nature to stagnate." People derived great benefit from their discussions and the reading of papers, but their improved knowledge of the Faith did not necessarily "lead to the organization of action on an efficient basis." The Australians reported that because such groups enrolled anyone who came, including many who were not genuine leaders or ready to sacrifice themselves for others, the general standard tended to be "fairly mediocre." The only way to overcome this failing was "to insist that the Discussion Group become a group of leaders who definitely consecrate themselves to the conquest of a particular environment or class." From these reflections on matters of technique, Hillenbrand's Australian advisors spelled out the organizational implications. Since "organized action for leaders in their own particular mass" was the way to achieve results, they were attempting to set up national movements of farmers, workers, middle class, university and professional people. From a small number of "mere discussion groups" their organizers had developed specialized units of lay leaders and were ready to gather "the mass of people of their own kind into strong and comprehensive movements."[84]

---

[82] Ibid.; and Farrell to "Dear Father," October 23, 1940, Hillenbrand papers.

[83] Hillenbrand to Farrell, October 31, 1940, Hillenbrand papers.

In contrast, the direction of future efforts by the N.C.W.C. was spelled out in the acceptance of a series of resolutions which Francis C. Kelly, chairman of the episcopal committee on youth, submitted to the Administrative Board on November 12, 1940. The Bureau became a regular N.C.W.C. Department of Youth, charged with the chief objective of promoting and developing a National Catholic Youth Council. This organization followed the pattern of the adult councils, for it was designed to promote, under ecclesiastical supervision, interchange of information and service as well as unity and cooperation among all approved Catholic youth groups.[85] It was so constituted, argued its sponsors, to leave untampered the autonomy and initiative of its affiliated membership, since it left to each Ordinary final authority over the youth of his diocese. It provided a framework whereby, on a voluntary basis, existing councils, conferences, and youth associations could find their place within a National Council. Episcopal chairmen of the departments of Youth and of Lay Organizations would determine "in detail" the "close collaboration" between the two.[86] One major emphasis of the new department was suggested in part by Guiseppe Cardinal Pizzardo, who in April, 1940, had written to all the bishops in the United States to encourage the National Catholic Youth Council in order "better to promote Christian ideals and better to safeguard the young from the many pitfalls they encounter."[87]

---

[84] Australian National Secretariat of Catholic Action to Hillenbrand, October 31, 1940, ibid. See also "Unified Catholic Action, Report of the Episcopal Committee on Catholic Action in Australia," Catholic Mind, XXXIX (December 8, 1941), 11.

---

[85] See Paul F. Tanner, "The National Catholic Youth Council," Homiletic and Pastoral Review, XLI (June, 1941), 935.

[86] From minutes of the Administrative Board, N.C.W.C., November 12, 1940, as reproduced in Charter of the Youth Department, n.p., Hillenbrand papers. See also Paul Tanner, "The History of the Catholic Youth Council," Proceedings, Second National Conference on Catholic Youth Work (Washington, 1949), 29-30. The original minutes of the bishops' meeting are not available to scholars until 1990.

[87] Quoted from letter dated April 23, 1940, of His Eminence Cardinal Pizzardo, President of the Central Office of Catholic Action, for communication to the Most Reverend Ordinaries of the United States, in Amleto G. Cicognani, Apostolic Delegate to the United States, A Letter to the Diocesan Youth Directors on the National Catholic Youth Council (Washington, 1941), 8-9. Of Cicognani's letter Paul Tanner observed to diocesan youth

Sponsors of the Jocist approach were thinking along completely different lines. In Chicago, for instance, leaders of the new Catholic Action Federations were concerned less with protection from social influences than with their reformation through environmental reconstruction. Their new Leaders' Bulletin stated clearly the lines of operation. It was directed, the introduction to the November 27 issue declared, to those who had "put on Christ" in order "to renew the face of the earth." A Jocist leader, the editors explained, was one who drew his group members to greater sanctity and into a planned attack upon forces in the environment which prevented others from striving for that same sanctity. The editors explained that the social inquiry was the tool for the attack on harmful environmental influences and that such an inquiry would function most effectively among men or women who had similar interests and problems. They would examine the conditions of life affecting them and their associates and endeavor to discover how they could make them more Christlike. Upon these homogeneous groups rested a burden of responsibility, for it was lay apostles who had "the spirit and technique that will convert the world" and used "the only system...that will really work." Canon Cardijn had developed a method which could secure

---

directors, 30, that "until you know that letter perfectly you have not begun to be initiated into the A.B.C.'s of the organizational structure of Catholic Youth work in the United States."

the complete religious, moral, social, and intellectual training that Pope Pius XI had declared necessary for lay apostles to the world. Leaders were reminded, therefore, "that the Social Inquiry is always environmental" and that "action is the most important part of the inquiry."[88]

Hillenbrand soon determined that the N.C.W.C. decision affected the possibility of securing publication for McGuire's manual, which had been given for review to an episcopal committee headed by Archbishop John Gregory Murray of St. Paul. At McGuire's request, he wrote to Rev. Richard T. Doherty, professor at the St. Paul major seminary, to inquire about its status. "It would be sad to think that the manual would never be made available to the priests of this country," he suggested. "His [McGuire's] letter did not sound hopeful that the Knights would continue any further support for Catholic Action. And that threw doubt into his own return to this country.[89] Doherty explained that the delay in publication came only because Archbishop Murray had not completed his forward.[90] It soon became clear, however, that the manual would not be published. Doherty notified Father Farrell that the bishops "didn't like Paul McGuire and the K.C.'s introducing the movement."[91] Much later, Vincent Mooney informed Hillenbrand that he met "entrenched opposition" to his efforts to include the specialized movements in the program of laying groundwork for "a unified youth set-up under NCWC auspices." His attempts to publish through the national conference an adapted version of a French Y.C.W. manual failed.[92]

---

[88] See Catholic Action Leaders' Bulletin, I (November 27, 1940), 1, 2-3, 8, 9. (Their italics.)

[89] Hillenbrand to Richard T. Doherty, December 17, 1940, Hillenbrand papers.

[90] Doherty to Hillenbrand, December 27, 1940, ibid.

Such was the structure of the N.C.W.C. that individual bishops could do what staff personnel often could not. In Fort Wayne, Indiana, Bishop John Noll gave permission to Putz's Catholic Action Students to continue their work. That group had grown from five to fifty-five, and its Leaders' Bulletin was rapidly increasing its circulation. Upon receipt from Eugene Geissler, first president of the organization, of a request for official approval, Noll assured the group that "you have my unconditional commission to go."[93] He told the group that he was deeply appreciative of their effort to infuse into the entire Notre Dame student body a spirit of Catholic Action. "I am well acquainted with Paul McGuire's work," Noll added, "and I am glad to learn that your plan is built on the French and Belgium Jocist idea."[94] With this approval, the Catholic Action Students expanded their program and were soon emulated by a new cell at Dayton University, Dayton, Ohio, which began on December 8, 1940 to publish its own Catholic Action Bulletin.[95]

---

[91] Farrell to Hillenbrand, February 6, 1941, ibid., quoting Doherty.

[92] Vincent Mooney, C.S.C., to Hillenbrand, February 17, 1959, ibid.

[93] John F. Noll, bishop of Fort Wayne, Indiana, to Eugene S. Geissler, President, Catholic Action Students, University of Notre Dame, December 14, 1940, as reproduced in Leaders' Bulletin, II (February, 1941), 2.

The difference between general and specialized Catholic Action rested less upon the question of approval than upon an emphasis on different techniques; that is, the study club versus the cell, and upon a different viewpoint on the immediate priority of coordination as opposed to environmental impact. Hillenbrand, for example, was convinced that Catholic Action in "the real Jocist sense" held "more promise for the future than anything else."[96] The first directive for a successful apostolate was to make certain that all cell members realized that "theirs is the Christian crusade, the Christian revolution."[97] Joined to this image was an insistence that "the cell must be specialized according to sex, age, and vocation."[98] All members must dedicate themselves to the ideal of service to the people in their environment and must both know and possess the "spirit of the apostolate." The task of the priests was to communicate effectively this spirit. In pursuit of this objective, Hillenbrand met with Fathers Farrell, Boyd, Runkle, and Marhoefer for three hours at the Cathedral Rectory on December 30, 1940. In their meeting they examined critically the existing Chicago cells and determined how to enforce specialization, how to exclude those who held back the work of "Catholic Action," and how to separate "militants" from ordinary members.[99]

---

[94] Ibid.

[95] See "The University of Dayton's Past in the Field of Official Catholic Action," Catholic Action Bulletin, IV (September 15, 1943), 3.

[96] Hillenbrand to Rev. John E. Dolan, January 16, 1941, Hillenbrand papers.

[97] Mimeographed letter of Martin Farrell to "Dear Father," January 10, 1941, ibid.

[98] Ibid.

In large measure, this last objective explained the difference from the "general" approach. Rather than attempt to bring into their organization as many Catholics as possible, they wanted only those who agreed with them that religion must once again penetrate to the foundations of social, professional, and family life. Only in this way, the sponsors of Jocism determined, could the social kingdom of Jesus Christ, alone the source of peace and world prosperity, be established.[100] Rather than looking upon Catholic lay organizations as protective sanctuaries, they viewed their purpose in terms of developing a lay apostolate which would emerge as "the work of works, not simply a surgical dressing applied from without but as a real renaissance, a renovation, and a spiritual revolution."[101]

---

[99] Memorandum of Martin Farrell, "Notice of Special Meeting Regarding Catholic Action," sent to Hillenbrand, Donald Runkle, Charles Marhoefer, and William Boyd, December 27, 1940, Hillenbrand papers.

[100] See "Editorial," Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin, I (January 16, 1941), 3-4.

The conceptual structure which suffused the Jocist organizing effort, therefore, differed radically from the practical view which seemed to characterize that of the N.C.W.C. To Hillenbrand and his team the question was not whether coordination of organized groups was important or valuable but the quality of life which cell members radiated. Those promoting the specialized movements wished to see develop in what they regarded as a pagan society Christian lives, ideals, and institutions.[102] In consistent terms. they argued that their movement was not separatist or elitist but the practical offshoot of social conditions and a method demonstrably effective as a means of renovation. After two years of planning and discussion, this point remained unsettled. As the new year dawned, the Chicago priests under Hillenbrand's guidance took the next step and began a campaign to see their conception of Catholic Action more widely accepted.

---

[101] Ibid., 3.

[102] Ibid., 3-4.

CHAPTER FOUR

FORMULATING AN IDEOLOGY, 1941-1942

Champions of the cell movement believed it would call the social world from materialistic standards of thought and action to Christlike ones.[1] They aimed at collective renovation. They believed that the world must be purged of sin and returned to Christ and that lay Catholics had the duty and opportunity to help men who were searching for a way out of social misery, trouble, and destruction. The isolated action of individuals did not seem to them able to transform the mentality which the American social environment engendered or to counteract its exterior manifestations in institutions, laws, and customs.[2] Most necessary was a group of militants whose zeal for reform was comparable to that of Communists. When their charity and enthusiasm was "fired to the burning point," they could "impose on others the

---

[1] See "How Are We Progressing?" Catholic Action Leaders' Bulletin, I (July, 1941), 1.

[2] See Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C., The Mystical Body and the Apostolate: Notes Adapted from Corps Mystique et Apostolat of Chanoine P. Glorieux (South Bend, Indiana, [1941]), 11.

XUM

Christian way of living."[3] In his resume of the principles of Catholic Action, James J. O'Toole argued that too many were men of little faith. "Catholic Action is not just a possible solution of modern problems but our only solution," he explained; "reject it and there is no other way. Accept it and a new day is at hand."[4] The Chicago leaders declared, "We aim not only at personal perfection but at perfection of our environment. We want to Christianize all peoples, all things--'to restore all things in Christ.'"[5]

In the furtherance of these aims, however, propagandists of the cell movement faced two problems. Catholic lay activities most striking to the public and many bishops took place in the large fraternal, religious, and ethnic organizations founded long before, and associated together in the N.C.W.C. The great majority of American bishops, therefore, naturally turned to the N.C.W.C. for guidance in the effort to organize the laity. They expected from its departments and its professional staff a plan that would foster the proper degree of unity and cooperation. While midwestern priest-leaders were coming to see the cell movement as the most effective means of establishing a lay apostolate, priests and bishops elsewhere thought cells a foreign import. The general assent to papal promulgations masked competing perspectives on goals, methods, and organizational forms. Secondly, no practical manuals were available in English which explained to laymen why they should be united in a vast network of "cells" of men, women, students, and workers who shared similar interests and problems. Only infrequently did standard Catholic literature stress that each individual must work with others as a "specialized" group within a particular environment.[6]

---

[3] "We Must Get This Over," *Catholic Action Leaders' Bulletin*, I (May, 1941), 5.

[4] Rev. James J. O'Toole, *What is Catholic Action?* (New York, 1940), 63.

[5] "Catholic Action--Not Catholic Motion," *Catholic Action Leaders' Bulletin*, I (January 29, 1941), 7.

In Chicago, Msgr. Hillenbrand reasoned that, regardless of the sacrifice, he and those whom he could persuade to help must implement the call of Pius XI and Pius XII and identify the "cell movement" with the official term, "Catholic Action." He determined by this means to foster "a more definite conception, not something vague."[7] So widely had the phrase "Catholic

---

[6] On the lack of English literature directed to the precise issue of specialization, see Martin Farrell to Hillenbrand, November 1, 1940; November 29, 1941, Hillenbrand papers. See also Rev. William Ferree, S.M., Introduction to Catholic Action (rev. ed., Washington, D.C., n.d.), 72.

[7] Interview with Reynold Hillenbrand, June 10, 1970. See also "New Volume of the Bulletin," Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin, IV (October, 1943), 2; and "About the Bulletin," ibid., III (November, 1942), 9. In this resume the editors said of their publication that "it represented the first methodical effort to get the doctrine, both in theory and as it grew out of the work

Action" been used that all types of lay organizations represented their work as falling under that rubric. Hillenbrand thought too few Catholics realized that the Jocist technique was at once simple and profound enough for every type of person. In his view, too few had analyzed keenly the definition which Pius XI had attached to "Catholic Action."[8] On January 16, 1941, therefore, he released the first issue of a new publication, the _Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin_.

From the outset the bulletin set forth a synthesis. In twelve pages, Hillenbrand not only listed the prerequisites for successful cell work but summarized the priests' apostolate, the necessity of Catholic Action as outlined by Pope Pius XI, and the importance of using French and Belgian methods. The work "must exhibit the qualities of purposeful, intelligent, self-directed 'action' as opposed to mere impulsive, externally applied motion," he declared. It must not consist simply of a haphazard reaction against a bad environment but a "concrete, well-planned and competently directed attack on the stronghold of sin."[9] The bulletin excerpted

---

in Chicago, into some permanent and easily accessible form." Content analysis of the bulletin articles clearly demonstrates the intent to establish a virtual identification between the "cell movement" and the official organization, Catholic Action.

[8] "Catholic Action--Not Catholic Motion," _Catholic Action Leaders' Bulletin_, I (January 29, 1941), 4.

[9] "Catholic Action--Not Catholic Motion," _Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin_, I (January, 1941), 3.

sections of a recent review of a new pamphlet, "The Priest and the Y.C.W.," which called for a new relationship between priest and people. Hillenbrand documented the work in which the Catholic Action Federations were engaged by presenting a translation of the portions of Cardijn's *Manual on the J.O.C.* dealing with the leaders' meeting. As for priests, the bulletin argued, "the most important and essential task of all is the training and formation of new cells and new leaders until a network of sections has been spread across the land."[10] The publication pictured the cell movement as the embodiment of the specific wishes of the Holy See.

To buttress this point, Farrell had insisted that speakers at the January meeting where the new publication was released support their points with quotations from the Holy Father. Only so, he wrote to Clement Jagodzinski, could they "convince the other Fathers." At a subsequent meeting that month the Federation leaders planned to arrange the cells on the basis of still greater specialization, mixing discussion with instruction in order to "turn this thing upside down" and "put over our points."[11] Farrell asked Hillenbrand to "watch for lack of prudence. I'm afraid I make things too definite. Yet it can't be too indefinite."[12] Farrell hoped that their movement could proceed quite openly, and urged that it be called "Specialized C.A." in order to distinguish it from the Holy Name Society, which Archbishop Stritch favored as the means through which to establish Catholic Action.[13] The Chicago chaplains didn't want Stritch to think they claimed to have the only Catholic Action, even though that was the core of their conviction.[14]

---

[10] "Editorial," *Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin*, I (January, 1941), 2.

[11] Farrell to Rev. Clement Jagodzinski, January 8, 1941, Hillenbrand papers.

Even youthful cell members were cognizant that the vagueness of Stritch's approach and the lack of formal approval for their interpretation were hindrances. In a cell meeting at Holy Name Cathedral, one speaker declared that the Archbishop "had not been very clear in defining the term Catholic Action."[15] He applied it to work done by the Holy Name Society, the Sodality, Catholic school children, and comparable groups. Members learned that their first obligation was to Catholic Action, defined precisely as the cell approach, simply because they were already in the movement. The secretary reported that their chaplain, George Slominski, "did not recommend severing connections entirely with other organizations" since they might find in them other apostles, but maintained instead that their "greatest responsibility was to the Catholic Action group."[16] The difficulty was, Father James Kilgallon later remarked, that "Catholic Action" meant almost anything and, therefore, nothing.[17] At issue were the qualities of leadership, the forms of organization, and the struggle to bring unity out of diversity.

---

[12] Farrell to Hillenbrand, February 8, 1941, ibid.

[13] See supra, 94; and Hillenbrand to John Hayes, October 3, 1940, Hillenbrand papers; and Farrell to Hillenbrand, June 18, 1941, ibid.

[14] See Farrell to Hillenbrand, June 18, 1941, Hillenbrand papers, for a statement to this effect.

[15] "Report on Holy Name Cathedral Meeting, March 25, 1941," Zotti papers.

Social movements which aim at counteracting prevailing values often rely upon a new conceptual framework to help establish their necessity and value. Within American Catholicism, such an ideological framework needed to comprehend both theological and organizational issues. In the March issue of their Leaders' Bulletin, the editors insisted that "the problem of specialization is a pressing one." Groups, they explained, must

> be composed of people who are alike, who form a community of interests and have the potentiality to influence those who are similar to themselves--those who are in the same situation, those who meet the same problems, have the same hopes, suffer the same difficulties. Their very similarity tends to give them a union and a sympathy which a disparate group could not achieve.[18]

The editorial advised each cell leader that if his group was "not specialized according to age, sex, and vocation in life," it was his responsibility as the leader "to see that it is so re-formed at once."[19] They had earlier explained that their movement aimed at a "social formation" of personality, by which they meant a training that would enable them to live Christian lives not only as individuals "but as members of society, as members of our particular environments."[20] Even though that approach represented "something different" which group members might have difficulty in understanding, it was altogether necessary to their work. "But you must use it," the editors insisted. "If you do, understanding will follow. The formation is not that of a good Catholic. You are something higher than that. You are a member of Catholic Action."[21]

---

[16] Ibid.

[17] This statement was made at the Summer School of Catholic Action at Holy Name Cathedral on July 2, 1941. See Martha Stoeck, "Notes from the Summer School of Catholic Action," 10, Zotti papers.

[18] "Like to Like," Catholic Action Leaders' Bulletin, I(March, 1941), 1.

Farrell thought the lay members in the various Catholic Action Federations were beginning to feel their responsibilities, but he was also convinced that, despite their rhetoric, none of the cells were centering their action on the real problems of an unchristian environment. If priests insisted that lay members press the attack on "paganism" in their environment, he advised Hillenbrand, they could "watch the dead wood break off."[22]

---

[19] Ibid. (Their underlining.)

[20] See "Catholic Action--Not Catholic Motion," Catholic Action Leaders' Bulletin, I (January 29, 1941),6.

[21] Ibid., 5.

[22] Farrell to Reynold Hillenbrand, April 5, 1941, ibid.

The lay claim that they were more than good Catholics seemed to him a display of spiritual snobbery. William Boyd argued that the priests must not allow the lay leaders to "lose sight of the solidarity of the movement while we are strengthening the Federations."[23] As counselor and guide to the priests working with cells, Hillenbrand similarly was opposed to any actions or claims that could injure the movement. As signs of unchecked lay enthusiasm emerged, Farrell called a special meeting of the chaplains' board. Although much had been accomplished since the September reorganization, he explained, there was still much reason for concern. "We hope to find a solution for some of the difficulties and ways to surmount the obstacles," he argued, adding that a significant problem was how to give the Actionists a deeper spiritual life.[24]

Under the leadership of Hillenbrand and James Kilgallon, cell leaders attended a two week summer school aimed at teaching them how to make group adjustments as well as giving them more insight into the principles which directed their movement. Kilgallon explained that the members were involved in a revolution which, unlike the negative movements of Communism and Nazism, relied

---

[23] Rev. William Boyd to Hillenbrand, [April, 1941], Hillenbrand papers.

[24] Farrell to Hillenbrand, William Boyd, Joseph Connerton, Edward Rapp, William Clark, Donald Runkle, and George Slominski, May 20, 1941, _ibid_.

XUM

on Christian love. Such revolutionary action, he explained, "takes courage and time. We get a few leaders first. We put them into specialized groups."[25] Their groups were called cells because they were "going to multiply" and "to put a spirit of Christian service into the world." Militants should love the movement but remember that it was the work of God's grace and as "Catholic Action" represented "the Church on the march." In his single appearance at the school, Farrell underlined this theme and explained that the pope wanted an organization which would build on the order of the hierarchy and embrace a wide variety of individuals. The organization should not be like the stones for a building or like a machine but resemble a living body.[26]

In seven lectures Hillenbrand underlined the sacramental and doctrinal sources of the movement. He stressed the social meaning of the sacraments of Baptism and Confirmation, and the dogma of Christ's Mystical Body.[27] Through Baptism men were incorporated into Christ, and through Confirmation they participated in His priesthood. He gave particular emphasis to the dogma of Christ's Body. Just as in the human body there were many cells, living the life of the whole organism, so also in Christ's "mystical" body, the Church, all lived with and by His life. Although there were other figures in the Gospel for "grace," that is, supernatural life, that of a living organism was best because it portrayed all the essential elements of God's plan of redemption and exemplified collective life, at once individual and plural, of which Christ's personal grace was the source. Before Pentecost the Apostles formed a society in which members were individually united to Christ; afterwards they formed an organism, united to Christ and to one another collectively.[28] The Church, then, was the extension of Christ in time and in space. As a body, it was a growing thing; and when it had grown to perfect stature, the human race would have achieved its purpose and the world would end.[29]

---

[25] See Martha Stoeck, "Notes," 25, Zotti papers.

[26] Ibid., 63.

[27] Ibid., 5-8; 17-24; 29-33; 41-48; 55-61; 72-77; 85-91. See also Mary Irene Caplice, "School of Catholic Action," Zotti papers; and [Reynold Hillenbrand], "School for Specialized Catholic Action," Hillenbrand papers.

Hillenbrand appears by all of this to have been arguing that the cell movement, though presently small, took its meaning from God's eternal plan. An extant student's notebook suggests some of the relationships he drew. "The Mystical Body is impetus for C.A. [Catholic Action]," wrote Martha Stoeck, one of the cell members in attendance. "The divine life which man has must penetrate human action. When this is done in an organized

---

[28] [Reynold Hillenbrand], "School for Specialized Catholic Action," 3, Hillenbrand papers.

[29] Ibid., 4.

XUM

way, it is C.A. Christ and His divine life must penetrate these environments. If this doesn't happen, the M.B. [Mystical Body] is weak, is unhealthy. C.A. is the effort on my part to accomplish that. It must be [done in a] specialized, organized way."[30] Other extant notes suggest clearly the central argument. The movement aimed to make Christ complete by working upon the members of His Body "in order to build up the Mystical Christ" and to "bring His Body to [the] beauty and splendor that He wants it to have."[31]

What transpired in the school was, in effect, the articulation of an ideology. The teachers synthesized Cardijn's emphasis on specialized groups with the papal call for Catholic Action and European theological reflections on the mystery of Christ's Mystical Body. They spelled out an all-embracing conception which encompassed spiritual life, apostolic action, and the dreams of Christ's vicar. Religion was more than a string of external practices, they explained. Lay action depended on a "profound Catholicity" which in turn rested upon a divine plan which assigned to each man his proper function. Although the chaplains were aware of Stritch's mixed reactions to the cell method, they described social life in terms of Cardijn's distinctive emphasis upon

---

[30] Martha Stoeck, "Notes," 88-89, Zotti papers.

[31] [Hillenbrand], "School for Specialized Catholic Action," 7, Hillenbrand papers.

XUM

"environments."[32] Even though the cell movement was only in its early stages, they suggested, it was the central instrument for social regeneration.

In the immediate aftermath of the school, the laymen dropped from their bulletin the irritating tone of superiority, ~~but~~ they continued to maintain that each individual work with others in his own particular environment. They minimized grandiose expectations by stressing that

> Christ depends on us to shed a little light in our own circle.... We may not be able to restore ALL things in Christ, by ourselves, but we can do something about those things which we can touch and influence. If we start with the *little* things, we *gradually* *build* *up* to the *larger* things. And when *many* persons are doing the little things, the result will be very great.[33]

The adoption of humbler rhetoric enabled the leaders to argue more vehemently the value of specialization and to express more confidently their hopes for success. "We cannot create Catholic Action by means of external organization and mass psychology," they continued. It must be first developed in the individual and then communicated in a personalist approach. "The results may not be evident for years," the editors concluded, "but they will be the inevitable result if we apply ourselves with full strength to the cause of Christ."[34]

---

[32] See [Hillenbrand], "School for Specialized Catholic Action," 7, Hillenbrand papers. A central theme of Jocist literature was that "it is the milieu which forms and the milieu that deforms. It is the milieu that paganizes or Christianizes, corrupts or educates." See Pierre Bayart, *L'Action spécialisée catholique* (Montreal, n.d.), 33-34; and P. Lelotte, S.J., *Fundamental Principles of Catholic Action*, trans. J.P. Kelly (3rd ed., Melbourne, n.d.), 56-59.

[33] "What is Catholic Action?" *Catholic Action Leaders' Bulletin*, ~~I~~ (July, 1941), 3. (Their capitals and italics).

The Federations' leaders attended less to Stritch's caution than to the progress of the movement in other centers. In Toledo, they soon learned, Bishop Karl Alter was following the publication of The Cells with great interest and with considerable hope for a steady development of the movement. At Notre Dame, Eugene Geissler was preparing to release the first substantial English study of how the movement actually educated its members. That book, Farrell explained to cell members at a Cathedral meeting on July 30, 1941, corroborated what he and Hillenbrand argued: the need for a clearer understanding of Catholic Action. Geissler's six chapters distinguished between "universal" and "specialized" Catholic Action, explained the latter in Jocist terms, and argued that a balanced combination of study, personal sanctification, and apostolic action were prerequisites for permanent success in lay organizations. He predicted that the cells would continue as a means of forming socially concerned personalities "as long as Catholic Action exists and no matter how large it grows." They balanced prayer, study, and action, and gave form to inner life

---

[34] Ibid.

XUM

rather than imposing an external superstructure.[35]

On September 18, 1941 Archbishop Stritch laid out before over a hundred priests gathered in the Cathedral Auditorium the guidelines he wished the cell movement to observe. The cells should not lay exclusive claim to the title of Catholic Action, but should do their work quietly and without much publicity. Their work should not be done in existing organizations, and all existing cells should join one of the nine federations in order to maintain diocesan-wide unity.[36] The cell movement could be a blessing if carried on in the spirit of the Church but would be the source of much evil if carried on imprudently. "Anything in the Catholic Church that is not plainly above the surface can be dangerous," Stritch declared, noting that there were "more dangers in this movement" than in large lay organizations. The Archbishop insisted that cells be "very definitely" and "very closely" under the direction of priests. Only persons with rugged piety and common sense should be

---

[35] For Bishop Alter's reaction to the cell movement, see his letter to the Toledo Cell Movement Propagandist, July 22, 1941, as reproduced in The Cells, II (August, 1941), 4. For Farrell's comments on the book, see the notes of Martha Stoeck for the cell meeting at Holy Name Cathedral, July 30, 1941, Zotti papers. For Geissler's viewpoint on specialization and on the need for a clearer conception, see Eugene Geissler, Training of Lay Leaders: An Introduction to Catholic Action (South Bend, 1941), esp. iv, 17-21.

[36] See "The Archbishop on Catholic Action," Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin, II (October, 1941), 1-2.

XUM

admitted. Priests should remember that "in some parts of the world Catholic Action cells became ineffective because there was too much exterior work and not enough spirituality." The chaplains must exchange experiences and plan for intelligent leadership.

Stritch predicted that the cell movement would never attract large numbers. It supplemented "large Catholic lay organizations" by picking a few and engaging them in definite forms of lay action. Priests must coordinate the work. In special cases, cells could be interparochial. In all cases they must serve as aids to "the apostolate of the Church which is carried on by bishops and pastors and the priests of the diocese." There was to be no publicity. "That would spoil it," Stritch insisted. "It is a quiet work, even unknown to the general Catholic public." Nevertheless, he concluded, it was important to engage people in neighborhood problems: cells could do some good work in resolving them. He placed great confidence in the priests already active in the movement and urged them to "study and prepare the technique that you need to go with it."[37]

---

[37] My summary of Archbishop Stritch's speech is based on a typescript entitled, "Talk to Priests Interested in Catholic Action--Cell Movement, The Most Reverend Samuel A. Stritch," Hillenbrand papers. All quotations are taken from that document. For a summary of nine basic points set forth in that address, see "The Archbishop on Catholic Action," Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin, II (October, 1941), 1. Also available in the Hillenbrand papers is a handwritten summary of eight points of Stritch's speech. It is important to note that this was a private meeting of priests, not open to the laity, and with no

He suggested that Hillenbrand visit with Martin Carrabine, S.J., moderator of the Chicago Inter-Student Catholic Action (CISCA), to talk over the relationship between it and the cell movement. On Monday afternoon, September 22, the two men met and worked out an agreement based on Stritch's guidelines. The method of seeing, judging, acting would be confined to the specialized cells and CISCA would not use it. Carrabine promised that he would see Hillenbrand to discuss "any difficulty which may actually or seemingly exist" between the two organizations.[38] This agreement confirmed the Archbishop's approval.

In early October, Farrell began to call for a reorganization. He sent for Hillenbrand's suggestions an article on "the spirit of Catholic Action."[39] In the article Farrell reminded priests that they must continue to insist on the inquiry technique and specialization while remembering that such elements were useless "apart

---

publication of Stritch's remarks with the exception of the nine-point summary.

[38] Martin Carrabine, S.J., to Hillenbrand, September 23, 1941; Hillenbrand to Carrabine, September 27, 1941. For the work of CISCA and Father Carrabine, see Geaney, "The Chicago Story," 288-89.

[39] Farrell to Hillenbrand, October 3, 1941, Hillenbrand papers. For the article, see [Martin Farrell], "The Spirit of Catholic Action," *Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin*, II (November, 1941), 4-5; and [Farrell], "Spirit of Catholic Action," *ibid*., II (December,1941), 4-5.

XUM

from the spirit of the apostolate."[40] Priests must realize that the movement was not just an activity for Catholics nor even a society whose sole aim was personal sanctification but "truly and strictly" the apostolate of Jesus Christ.[41] In his covering letter, Farrell explained that the spirit would differentiate the cell movement from CISCA and the sodalities. When priests had fully explored this animating principle, they should discard the outline for meetings and undertake a new method. Further, Farrell recommended discontinuance of the general leaders' bulletin issued since the previous year. The nine federations should undertake their own study days and begin to think of issuing separate specialized bulletins.[42] Hillenbrand supported the new program by writing to the Canadian president of the J.E.C. to request thirteen Jocist publications.[43]

---

[40] [Farrell], "The Spirit of Catholic Action," Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin, II (November, 1941), 4.

[41] Ibid.

[42] See Farrell to Hillenbrand, October 3, 1941; October 22, 1941, Hillenbrand papers. See also "Federation Bulletin," Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin, II (November, 1941), 7. The November announcement noted of the federations that "their specialized work calls for a specialized bulletin, even if at first it is only a series of inquiries."

[43] Hillenbrand to Gerard Pelletier, October 24, 1941, Hillenbrand papers. The order included requests for, among others, Pollet's L'Action Catholique a la lumière de la théologie Thomiste, Fournier's La Théologie de l'Action Catholique, Richaud's Notions Sommaires sur l'Action Catholique, Canon Guerry's L'Action Catholique, and F. Lelotte's Pour Réaliser l'Action Catholique.

The response provided a new impetus. Not only did the Canadians send the books but they dispatched their secretary-general, Miss "Alek" Leduc, to bring advice and encouragement to cells in midwestern cities. She visited Chicago, Dayton, and South Bend and underlined the "mystique" of the specialized approach, that is, the development of "Christ-consciousness in individuals."[44] In their November bulletin the Dayton students explained that through Miss Leduc's visit they had understood better the spirit of the movement and felt the desire for more action.[45] "Now that we have seen what it can do for us, being Christ conscious, closer to God, and seen how it has worked," they stated, "the method, the results, the movement is more concrete and less abstract. We have something now we can grasp hold of."[46] In Chicago, the reaction was similar. Miss Leduc had "plenty of mystique," Farrell notified Hillenbrand, and her visit laid the groundwork for a profitable discussion on the spirit of the movement and the qualities of lay leaders.[47]

---

[44] "Observe, Judge and Act," *Catholic Action Bulletin*, II (November 15, 1941), 4.

[45] See "Our Visitor from Montreal, Miss Alek Leduc," *Catholic Action Bulletin*, II (November 15, 1941), 1; "Alek's Work in Dayton," *ibid*., 2; and "A Plan of Action," *ibid*., 3.

[46] "Our Visitor," 1.

[47] See Farrell to Hillenbrand, November 22, 1941, Hillenbrand papers. See also "Kind of Cell Member We Want," *Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin*, II (December, 1941), 3; and "Last Meeting," *ibid*., 4.

About the same time Vincent Mooney, director of the Youth Department, expressed his support. He notified the federation chaplains that they evidently had their feet on the ground: no exaggerated claims, no covering up of practical problems, and no bluff or bluster. Such realism, he indicated, was refreshing. He had long known of "the heroic efforts made by the various priests in Chicago to develop the specialized forms of Catholic Action." He had further realized the futility of furnishing from his office literature to help them carry out their task. The cell movement, he added, must

> develop in the grass roots. You can't transplant this type of movement from Belgium to Benton Harbor. A mushroom growth means nothing. While my interest in the Chicago set-up was very intense, I felt that nothing would be done in a practical way until the priests laid the groundwork.

Their October Priests' Bulletin he judged to be exceptionally well done. "You have all made a real contribution," he observed, and offered his prayer that God would bless their magnificent work.[48]

Such evidences of progress brought cheer to Hillenbrand, who had meanwhile experienced a sharp rebuke from the Archbishop. The rector had written Stritch to suggest that the Illinois Manufacturers' Association operated under an anti-labor policy. Stritch replied that Hillenbrand's "mental attitude" toward manufacturers would hinder his ability "to understand their problems" or to expound to them Catholic principles. "So as not to embarrass you, I withdraw my request that you and some of the young priests associated with you attend as Catholic priests the meetings," Stritch continued. "I am not interested in any Catholic labor activities which contribute to the building up of a class society or assumes as hopeless the conversion of management and ownership in industry to Catholic principles."[49]

---

[48] Vincent Mooney, C.S.C., to Catholic Action Federations, as reproduced in "Father Mooney's Letter," Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin, II (November, 1941), 9.

Stritch's reprimand raised serious questions. Under Hillenbrand's leadership, a significant number of Chicago priests had focused intensively on the problems generated by the depression and sought to develop a social program aimed at reconstituting economic relations on a more Christian basis.[50] The archbishop's comments suggested that Hillenbrand and his associates had become so pro-labor in their attitudes that their activities might be more strictly regulated. The reprimand came, moreover, at a time when Hillenbrand had determined that the complex problems of modern society could be resolved only through a broader vision of lay action and a more effectively organized movement for social regeneration. The Stritch letter could not be isolated from other indications of disfavor. Despite the glowing praise which Mooney heaped upon the Chicago priests, his syndicated column praised the Youth Councils as guaranteeing the external supervision, control, and direction of Catholic youth groups by the clergy. Although every group composed of Catholics called itself a "Catholic" organization, Mooney argued, lay organizations did not always represent Catholicism since the laity were often not sufficiently united under the hierarchy.[51] The occasion seemingly called for caution and careful diplomacy. In this troubled situation, Kanaly renewed contact with Hillenbrand to praise "the great work" he was doing and to suggest that "before too long we will be ready for a wider and more rapid development."[52]

---

[49] Archbishop Samuel Stritch to Hillenbrand, November 17, 1941, Hillenbrand papers.

[50] Interview with Reynold Hillenbrand, June 10, 1970. During the period when Hillenbrand was turning more directly to specialized Catholic Action as a way of fostering social regeneration, he continued his work with the Waukegan Labor School and with the priests' discussion clubs and parish labor schools. He thus continued the "social action" efforts under the N.C.W.C. format while he became more involved with the "Catholic Action" movement which embodied broader goals of reorienting social behavior.

Hillenbrand got some encouragement from Stritch's public posture. Only three days before his rebuke, the archbishop had joined with the other members of the Administrative Board to proclaim that "Christianity faces today its most serious crisis since the Church came out of the Catacombs." The growing evils of false doctrine, immorality, disbelief, and reborn paganism were seriously threatening the future of supernatural religion in the United States.[53] Hillenbrand interpreted this statement as no mere rhetorical device to reawaken spiritual concerns and impulses but as an accurate portrayal of the real state of Christianity. With modern civilization in such a sorry condition, those who had assumed responsibility for starting "Catholic Action" must press forward with their work. The main point at issue for priests was to enlighten both clerics and laymen to the true solution for the deep-cutting evils in society.[54]

---

[51] Vincent Mooney, C.S.C., "Leads for Leaders: Catholic Youth Council," Our Sunday Visitor, November 23, 1941, 7.

[52] Kanaly to Hillenbrand, November 19, 1941, Hillenbrand papers.

In late November, 1941, Hillenbrand and Farrell determined that "at all cost" they should continue the priests' meetings and proceed with their other plans.[55] Agreeing that the sessions must be better prepared, they concluded that, in the absence of sound English materials, they would use Geissler's Training Lay Leaders as the new source for discussion material and as a way of presenting their ideas more methodically.[56] The two observed the

---

[53] See Crisis of Christianity: A Statement of the Bishops of the United States, November 14, 1941 (Washington, 1941), 1, 15.

[54] See Farrell to Hillenbrand, January 25, 1942, Hillenbrand papers.

[55] See Hillenbrand to Farrell, November 22, 1941, and Farrell to Hillenbrand, November 28, 1941, ibid.

[56] Farrell to Hillenbrand, November 28, 1941, ibid. Farrell noted that he had "examined the books we have in English. You know how few they are. The only conclusion is that we should use 'Training Lay Leaders'. It is very good; it is inexpensive." In Dayton, Ohio, cell leaders were coming to the same conclusion. They found the whole book to rest upon the elaboration of one statement:

"astonishing interest" of priests across the country in the Chicago Priests' Bulletin and speculated whether these scattered evidences of interest might one day "crystallize into strong cell action in many localities."[57]

Just as they were beginning to implement their plans, they were confronted with a problem of larger dimensions than ever before. The attack on Pearl Harbor brought the United States to a total war and brought a host of new problems and questions. Would this new source of social dislocation blunt the preliminary efforts they had undertaken? In what fashion would public preoccupation with the conflict hamper their efforts to instill more widely and deeply a living sense of the great supernatural realities of life? Would they have to introduce substantial changes in the approach they had chosen, and could a vigorous lay apostolate provide a solution to the social difficulties war inevitably brought? In the immediate aftermath of the war declaration, Hillenbrand and his team of chaplains began formulating explicit answers to these questions.

"Though the classic formula of the Pope in all its implications is a very precise and definite thing, it assumes on application a further note or essential characteristic. This note is the note of 'specialization.' In practice there is really no such thing as universal Catholic Action as there is in theory." See "Training for Leaders," Catholic Action Bulletin, II (November 15, 1941), 10. See infra, 152, esp. n. 66.

[57] "Bulletin," Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin, II (December, 1941), 3.

Their primary answer was that the war would in some mysterious way serve a redemptive purpose. "Catholic Action," in the specialized format of cells, must dedicate itself to finding and realizing that purpose. Both in its inherent evil and as a threat to the American way of life, the war was secondary to a more serious threat, the growing influence of secularism. What took place on the battlefields and upon the great oceans would not be as important as the battle launched against secularism in America. Priests bore the responsibility, therefore, of building a properly organized movement of lay apostles, who would bring to the world the vision and the values it sorely needed. That movement was as indispensable as the priestly ministry itself. Hillenbrand, Farrell, Boyd, and Runkle met for seven hours on January 30, 1942 to devise ways to intensify their efforts. They decided to add to the Priests' Bulletin a deeper analysis of the fundamental purpose of the cell movement. They and other priests were convinced that short of a miracle there was no possibility of restoring the world to Christ without Catholic Action. Its lay members must see the war as indicative of the level to which modern society had declined and take collective action against the forces of secularism.

In February, therefore, Hillenbrand published the first of a series of articles presenting what he considered the proper solution to the problems intensified by the outbreak of the war. The article "What is the Solution?" sketched against the background of improper, distorted perspectives the "true solution," and took direct aim at the two methods of "withdrawal" and of "spiritual protectionism." The first sought to confront the problem of evil by placing the faithful in a fearful seclusion where anti-Christian forces did not hold sway. It transformed Catholics into Christian exiles cut off from the realities of life, the article argued, and was basically selfish because it "would abandon the condemned and confounded mass of humanity to its misery." The second method sought to fortify Christians against the institutional sources of evil. Its defensive attitude was unsatisfactory because it was not complete. In time, the forces of the environment could deform even the good Catholic. Priests could not be satisfied with getting people into a "state of grace," for this limited ministry stopped far short of rechristianizing every phase of life. Its worst error, however, was that it ran the great risk "OF LOSING THE SPIRIT OF CONQUEST AND OF REDUCING THE APOSTOLATE TO PIOUS WORKS." Moreover, the attitudes it engendered would perpetuate the error that the apostolate of Christ belonged exclusively to priests. If even considered as a possible solution to the grave problems of the day, such an approach would prevent Catholics from even coming to the realization that the apostolate was the normal radiation of every Catholic who was a complete

XUM

Christian.[58]

The only effective solution, then, lay in Catholic Action. "All things must be restored in Christ or many will fall to Satan. All things must be restored to the standard of the cross or many people will be lost. Catholic Action is the means whereby Christ will come to live in man and man's institutions."[59] The central purpose of the traditional parish differed from that of Catholic Action. The former aimed to preserve the Christian from harmful outside influences, whereas the first and chief objective of the latter was to conquer for Christ the world outside the parish, in which workers, students, and farmers lived. The parish organization emphasized personal salvation and resistance to temptations. Catholic Action went beyond this to develop lay apostles and to convince them of their responsibility to the environment.[60]

---

[58] See "What is the Solution?" Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin, II (February, 1942), 5-7. (Italics in article.)

[59] Ibid., 6. See John LaFarge, S.J., "Real Catholic Action Emerges from Fog of Generalities," America, LXVI (February 7, 1942), 481. He explained that "the aim of Catholic Action is not merely the preservation of persons from harm but what is evil in society. Its aim is much more ambitious, none other than the conquering of society for Christ, the bringing about the reign of Christian morals and Christian principles in a semi-paganized world. Hence a type of apostolate that is purely defensive, even when executed on a notably high plane, would not, from the point of view of conquest, be reckoned as strictly Catholic Action."

[60] See [Louis Putz], "Place of the Priest in Catholic Action," Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin, II (January, 1942), 3-5.

Specialized Catholic Action forsook isolation and spiritual protectionism in order to reconstruct social institutions, to rescue others from the false comfort of an undeveloped conscience, and to carve out a balanced reaction to the ills of modern society.[61] Catholic lay leaders had been surprisingly weak in exerting influence aimed at the rechristianization of society. "They are wasting their talents," the bulletin proclaimed. "They should be the leaders in the important fields and yet they are not." They must realize that unless Catholic Action through cell groups saved America, she would not be saved.[62]

---

[61] Hillenbrand had strong doubts about the efficacy of any approach which did not attempt to incorporate fully the unity of Catholic truth. In his judgment, the Catholic Worker movement represented one such unbalanced reaction to social evil. In their synthesis of agrarian thought and Christian personalism, they seemed to accentuate even more explicitly a total rejection of the possibility of redeeming the evils of the modern factory system. Their increased emphasis on Christian pacifism with the outbreak of the war seemed to corroborate the selectivity of their philosophy. In his interview of June 10, 1970 Hillenbrand noted that "Peter Maurin and Dorothy Day impressed a lot of priests. Later, when they took on the unencyclical tone of wanting to discard the present social order, not rebuild it, but discard it, start over, we parted company." In September, 1942 Hillenbrand expressed to Rev. Charles Nebel the basis of the cell movement's approach: "I am sending you a complete file of our Priests' Bulletins. You will find our ideas and techniques expressed in scattered places through it. We try to cleave very closely to the papal pattern." See Hillenbrand to Nebel, September 28, 1942, Hillenbrand papers.

[62] See "Need of Lay Leaders," Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin, II (March, 1942), 4.

The April bulletin attempted to unravel the web of misconceptions Hillenbrand believed was blunting Catholicism's sharpest weapon against secularism. He used that issue to oppose those who held "subjective conceptions" of Catholic Action or who did not want to be specialized. He appears to have hoped that a detailed examination of the aims of Catholic Action would provide definitive answers to three controverted questions: What is Catholic Action for? What does it hope to accomplish? What is its program?[63] Its two major articles sharply distinguished the cell movement of "real Catholic Action" from the multitude of organizations which Hillenbrand believed falsely and improperly applied that term to their activities. He felt that American Catholics were just beginning to clear their minds of false conceptions, and he assumed that lack of understanding rather than vested interests represented the real hindrance to wider acceptance of the cell technique.

The first article expostulated with those who used a technical term simply as a good expression in writing or speaking. "In America we have Catholic Action calendars, holy water fonts, and Catholic Action bazaars," the authors exclaimed. "Here Catholic Action is not even restricted to organizations or persons. The gobbler in the turkey booth, the wheel of fortune, are part of

---

[63] See "Attempt to Clarify the Term and the Idea: Catholic Action," Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin, II (April, 1942), 4.

Catholic Action."[64] They announced that they would not even quote the papal definition. "We have heard it rather too often," they stated. "It has never given a real realization of just what Catholic Action is to American Catholics because they immediately apply the words of the definition to pious associations and all apostolic movements."[65] The definition, for instance, did not say that it must be organized and specialized, even though papal doctrine made those qualities altogether necessary.[66] The authors fixed instead upon the papal distinction between "auxiliaries" and "Catholic Action" to offset organizational and interpretative rivalries. Such religious associations as Third Orders, Sodalities and Confraternities, and other Pious Unions were not outmoded, they conceded, but were properly understood as "Auxiliaries to Catholic Action."[67]

---

[64] Ibid., 3.

[65] Ibid., 3-4.

[66] Ibid., 4. In view of this rigorous insistence on the papal attitude toward specialization, Lelotte's remark supplies an important clarification. The Jesuit observed that "it should be noted, however, that the organization of Catholic Action on a specialized basis does not constitute an essential mark of Catholic Action which must appear in every age but that such a method of organization is imposed upon us by the circumstances in which we live and to which we must adapt Catholic Action." See F. Lelotte, Fundamental Principles of Catholic Action, 60.

[67] See "Attempt to Clarify the Term and the Idea," 3. See also, James J. O'Toole, "The Auxiliaries: Other Societies," in What is Catholic Action? (New York, 1940),

XUM

The second article distilled the essential points that Hillenbrand, Putz, and Kanaly had long argued. Specialization was the best way to convert the world, if not the only possible way. Right from the beginning, it could work in any city or town in America, thus counteracting the "very deficient organization" of mixed groups. Recent popes had been pleading for an apostolate of "like to like;" through its specialized format, cell action was a response to those pleas and a fulfillment of Pius XI's insistence on "the golden rule of specialization."[68] Although the cell movement held no monopoly on Christian ministry, the usual result when specialization was violated was a study or social club and never vital or zealous lay action. Those who gathered general groups in neighborhood or parishes to study and prepare themselves for Christian social action might visualize their program as a good plan, but such efforts generally ended in such "fatalities" as opposition to specialization and superficial training.[69]

55-57; F. Bennett, "Catholic Action and Its Auxiliary Works," in What Does the Pope Say About Catholic Action, 38-41; "Catholic Action and Other Parish Works," Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin, II (September, 1942), 4; and "The Organization of Catholic Action," ibid., III (October, 1942), 5-8. The distinction between "auxiliaries" and "Catholic Action" became crucial in terms of organizational rivalry and in terms of application of papal teachings.

[68] "Cell Technique: Specialization," Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin, II (April, 1942), 7.

[69] Ibid.

Hillenbrand's detailed exposition of specialization and auxiliaries soon gave him stature as a recognized consultant on lay action. He had published his definite conception of Catholic Action at the same time as the National Council of Catholic Men embarked on a program to secure a "mandate" for its diocesan councils. In early spring, John Bowen, field representative of the N.C.C.M. came to St. Mary of the Lake seminary to discuss its program. Hillenbrand and William Clark explained that references to the cell in the N.C.C.M. manual were not accurate. They advised him to revise the booklet in order to follow the idea of specialization as perfectly as possible. Shortly thereafter, Bowen asked how to solve a problem his organizing work presented. His other advisors suggested that he could develop complete specialization by forming a cell of parishioners who met together for prayer and study and followed the social inquiry technique. These men would then exercise apostolic influence among those they contacted daily in office, factory, or some other environment. "I wish you would comment on this point," Bowen wrote, "because you can readily see the difficulty of trying to build up cells where there may be just one man from a given office or factory."[70] Hillenbrand replied that insufficient numbers from the same office or factory were no real problem because Bowen had misconceived the nature of the cell. "I think the solution of your difficulty," he replied, "is to be found in the fact that a cell may be composed of people from different factories or from different offices." Cells must include either all office or all factory workers, but their members need not work for the same employer. Moreover, he explained, Bowen didn't seem to realize that organizing men of different kinds of occupations violated Cardijn's guidelines. He cautioned that

---

[70] John G. Bowen to Hillenbrand, May 2, 1942, Hillenbrand papers.

> of the three kinds--"specialization by age, sex, and vocation"--you would have only specialization by sex and miss the other two cardinal points. In the kind of cell that you mentioned (all sorts of men) you simply cannot get ahead with the "See, Judge, and Act" properly. There will be all kinds of observations, all kinds of judgments necessary, and all kinds of actions.

This meant, he concluded, "all kinds of mentalities to contend with. It will not work."[71]

Hillenbrand welcomed the news that Bowen now proposed the diocesan councils as "auxiliaries." In a second letter, the N.C.C.W. organizer explained that he was openly expounding Hillenbrand's interpretation. "I have tried to explain," he wrote, "that the Diocesan Councils are primarily a federation of auxiliaries of Catholic Action and that perhaps their greatest value in the cause...is that they are practical machinery for opening the way for the development of specialized

---

[71] Hillenbrand to Bowen, June 2, 1942, ibid.

Catholic Action."[72] Bowen hoped that Hillenbrand or other Chicago priests could visit other dioceses to explain their approach, since that "would help beyond any other way I know to spread the day when we will have some specialized cells in the center of the parish picture of Catholic Action in the dioceses where we have been working."[73] Hillenbrand was completely convinced that any attempt to transform "auxiliaries" into mandated Catholic Action was a serious mistake. In his view, the new N.C.C.M. presentation represented a correct understanding of the proper role of general councils. Bowen's position, however, represented a private opinion and not public N.C.W.C. policy.

In April, the Youth Department of N.C.W.C. issued a discussion club booklet, entitled Introduction to Catholic Action. It controverted Bowen's position by suggesting instead that Diocesan Councils might perhaps be transformed from auxiliaries into official Catholic Action organizations. Its author, William Ferree, S.M., obliquely attacked Hillenbrand's view of the councils, the cell technique, and the inquiry method. He stated that the normal approach was to build up Catholic Action from the beginning and not to try to transform auxiliaries. He argued, however, that such a transformation "might be a normal procedure" when the question was one of already existing diocesan councils of men, women, or youth.[74] In other organizations such a reorientation would involve a radical shifting of fundamental purposes, but in the case of the councils it would be mostly a matter of introducing greatly improved methods and more definite principles of action and organization. Ferree conceded that the N.C.W.C. did not conform in all respects with the Holy See's pattern for Catholic Action, but he suggested that it was "nevertheless quite obvious that as Catholic Action develops it will fall within the present framework," particularly within the National Councils, since the 1936 episcopal statement expressed the will of the bishops "that the N.C.W.C. be the instrument through which the official action of the Laity be developed."[75] He described the cell technique as an "intensely social form of action" and as a "powerful method of apostolate," but countered Hillenbrand's synthesis by adding that

---

[72] Bowen to Hillenbrand, May 26, 1942, ibid. (His italics).

[73] Ibid.

> it may be useful to insist here that a "cell" has meaning _only_ _inside_ _a_ "_body_"--i.e., within the official organization of Catholic Action. A number of "cells" have been started in this country as isolated and self-sufficient ventures. Their proper place is _within_ the official lay organization of the diocese, where they have a role to play of "preparation for Catholic Action" in the event that

---

[74] William Ferree, S.M., _Introduction_ _to_ _Catholic_ _Action_, (Washington, n.d.), 21.

[75] _Ibid_., 56-57

> "Official Catholic Action" has not yet been set up.[76]

Ferree treated the inquiry method as the only present known way of developing "the intense personal responsibility necessary," but cautioned that those working towards Catholic Action sometimes became so enthusiastic about it that they ran the danger "of giving the impression that it and the correlative 'cell technique' are the _whole_ of Catholic Action."[77] All those who examined papal principles, he concluded, should make a special effort to "see the Theory of Catholic Action _as a whole_."[78]

Proponents of specialization through the cell movement could not accept Ferree's ambivalent treatment of their approach as normative, nor could they take his strictures too seriously. In his review of the booklet, Farrell insisted that it did not "demonstrate how Catholic Action is to be organized or inaugurated in a parish."[79] Since it provided no detailed explanation of method or program, those who read or studied it were not prepared to start Catholic Action groups. They should turn instead to the Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin, where they would find such explanations.[80]

---

[76] _Ibid_., 50. (Ferree's capitals, bold face type, and quotation marks).

[77] _Ibid_., 38. (Ferree's quotation marks, and bold face type.)

[78] _Ibid_. (Ferree's capitals, and bold face type).

[79] [Martin Farrell], "A New Pamphlet," _Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin_, II (August, 1942), 9.

Similarly, advocates of concerted cell action could not endorse general appeals for lay initiative. In the June 6 issue of Ave Maria, for instance, John J. O'Connor wrote a strong indictment against American Catholics. He argued that Christianity was developing to the side of rather than within American society. It seemed an established fact, argued O'Connor, that Catholics had not yet established contact, in any real fashion, "either with the leaders or with the largely paganized masses." The war was a judgment on their smugness, supineness, and indifference to the papal appeals. In a condition of world disorder, the Church must make either leaders or the masses listen to its message and feel its influence, which had in the past been practically negligible and continued as "almost negligible today." It was vitally important, therefore, to undertake a campaign to make Catholic spirituality visible and to project a Christian, supernatural ideology into all phases of human life in order to make it a force with which men must reckon.[81]

---

[80] Ibid. Farrell's was not the only critical review. Writing to America magazine in early September, James D. Loeffler, S.J., noted that though it "might well be acclaimed as an important and much-needed contribution to our still meager literature on that subject" the third chapter espoused "the so-called unitary formula for all official Catholic Action." Loeffler found it necessary "to point out that 'the participation of the laity in the apostolate of the hierarchy' does not imply...that but a single society is to be mandated by the Bishops to cover the entire scope of their apostolic effort." Those Bishops who desired to utilize more fully and give official status to a particular society skilled in one branch of the apostolate, he continued, "are still free to give mandates of 'Catholic Action' to other organizations for other branches of the work, leading to greater efficiency in a manner which need not interfere with harmony. Societies thus named 'Catholic Action' need undergo no transformation nor change their purposes and methods, for it is these which justified their selection by the Bishops." The contrary view, argued Loeffler, had been repudiated by the N.C.W.C. nine years earlier. James D. Loeffler, S.J., "To The Editor," America, LXVII (September 5, 1942), 614; see also "The Basis of Catholic Action," America, LI (July 7, 1934), 294-96; and "Catholic Action Coordinated," America, LIV (February 8, 1936), 422-24. Kilian J. Hennrich, O.F.M., similarly was sharply critical. He suggested, in "Varia," Homiletic and Pastoral Review, XLIII (February, 1943), 480, that "it might give a clearer picture of Catholic Action than it does. But this might militate against the worldwide and all-inclusive organization as visualized by the author. Such an organization is only possible in a very limited degree and in a

A structured ideological framework enabled Hillenbrand and his key associates to detect organization implications in subtle verbal inconsistencies. O'Connor's

---

loosely connected form. It is not possible or desirable to bring all associations that might contribute to Catholic Action under one dominant direction, notwithstanding that the Apostolate of all Catholics is universal. Some of the auxiliaries to Catholic Action are undoubtedly more important than Catholic Action, the official organization, itself.... The booklet lacks the 'Imprimatur,' and the reviewer would not like to approve of the booklet without some previous revision." The editors of Catholic Action, the N.C.W.C. organ, saw the pamphlet, however, as the "most complete single pamphlet on Catholic Action available in the English language." See Catholic Action, XXIV (April, 1942), 32.

[81] See John J. O'Connor, "Action for God," The Catholic Mind, XL (August 22, 1942), 1-9, which reproduces the Ave Maria article.

recommendations echoed themes which Hillenbrand's team of priests had discussed throughout the spring.[82] Yet there was a distinct difference. Hillenbrand had elaborated a more definite conception of "Catholic Action" by careful attention to specific means and forms of organization, but O'Connor used the term simply to suggest an effort to propagate Christian ideals and principles to pagan and secular circles, no matter how it was done. He set forth no specific plan through which Christian values could be injected into society. He thereby ignored the issue which Jocist sponsors were coming to see as most crucial.

The major issue was the relationship of Christianity to the world and, more specifically, the place of Catholicism in American society. The real need, agreed the midwestern chaplains, was to promote lay holiness and to extend a Christian influence to the center of American life. Such radical change could not come from individuals working separately, but could develop only from corporate activity, carefully organized, led in worship by priest chaplains, and informed by social consciousness and vibrant passion for social regeneration.[83] The immediate task was to promote the super natural formation of mind, conscience, and virtue in those possessed of the natural qualities of leadership. As an effect of transformed consciences would come social transformation, for once consciences were rightly ordered, there would be right order in society.[84] If their movement was to develop an intense penetration into the environment, cell leaders must have followers who would cooperate with them in organized action and projects.

---

[82] See "Need of Lay Leaders," Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin, II (March, 1942), 3-4; and the regular bulletin reports of the monthly discussions.

[83] See "Cell Technique: Liturgy," Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin, II (March, 1942), 5-6.

In their June meeting, consequently, the Chicago priests began for the first time to discuss an important aspect of Jocist thought which they had not yet seriously examined: the nature and importance of informal "teams" through which cell members could spread their influence more widely. Hillenbrand made it clear that only natural leaders should belong in cells, following the slogan "leaders for the cells, cells for the leaders."[85] Followers who were under the influence of these natural leaders and who were willing to help should go on the "teams." What he received from the weekly cell meeting, the leader would transmit to his followers, thereby influencing them, Christianizing them, and molding their thinking.[86] One of the norms to use in determining whether or not a person belonged in a cell was to be his ability to form a team that could work with him to carry out plans for action. Through this mechanism, the Bulletin reported, would come the extension of influence which Catholic Action required. "In this way Catholic Action begins to penetrate.... This penetration follows the steps indicated by human nature, an unmistakable guide. Cell leader--to cell members--to the teams--to the rest.... Leaders, those directly led, all the rest influenced."[87] The teams supplied the means by which the influence of the cell leaders would reach the mass of mankind. The cardinal point, the Bulletin explained, was that people in any environment invariably followed their leaders. If those in leadership positions continued to be pagan, the world would continue to be pagan. To achieve the cherished goal of social restoration, lay leaders must assume responsibility for extending through others their personal influence so that the values they held thoroughly permeated the social environment.

---

[84] See Fitzsimons and McGuire, Restoring All Things, 66.

[85] See "Cell Technique: The Organization of 'Teams,'" Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin, II (July, 1942), 4.

[86] See "Last Meeting," ibid., II (July, 1942), 3.

Hillenbrand's Bulletin had always pointed to a differentiation between specialized Catholic Action and other apostolic movements or general organizations. By articulating the importance of teams, an approach modelled on the Jocist movement in Montreal, Hillenbrand added a keystone to the structure of organization proposed for

---

[87] Ibid.

Catholic Actionists. His interpretation called for the interaction of sanctity, leadership, spiritual values, and apostolic action. By June, 1942, his publication had elaborated the broad outlines of a full program. To those who had studied Jocist literature and had worked to implement its distinctive methodology, this systematic explanation seemed decisive. From El Reno, Oklahoma, Kanaly wrote the bulletin editors to praise their efforts. "I have been receiving and studying very carefully the 'Priests' Bulletin,'" he stated. "It is the real thing. You have got the real doctrine and method."[88]

In the area of both doctrine and method, then, Hillenbrand had laid foundations for a plan of action for specialized cell movements. In the synthesis which he elaborated were all the elements of what students later designated as a "way of life."[89] Systematic exposition of an abstract concept, however, did not necessarily entail full utilization of the means necessary to translate theory into organized action. Permeation of social institutions with Christian values represented a challenge which dedicated priests and lay Catholics had always set forth as a direct consequence of living faith. Clarity of understanding meant little if the gap between aim and achievement remained as wide as past experiences demonstrated. Nor had Hillenbrand's exposition eliminated the institutional sources of controversy. In short, his "definite conception" rested upon careful analysis but still lacked a broad program which held the promise not only of official approbation but of substantial public impact. If the existing cell movements had moved beyond the scope of Ferree's vision, they still stood as isolated ventures. The next task of chaplains and leaders was to counteract that situation and to add to their conceptual foundation the brick and mortar of an organized superstructure.

---

[88] From Donald J. Kanaly to the Priests' Bulletin, n.d., as reproduced in "Father Kanaly's Letter," Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin, II (June, 1942), 8.

[89] See infra, 327.

XUM

CHAPTER FIVE

BUILDING A PROGRAM, 1942-1945

Jocist perspectives required priests to face real problems as well as theological difficulties. By the summer of 1942, clerical chaplains of lay Catholic Action had established a refined conception of the dimensions of their movement and had transmitted this ideology to diverse student and worker groups. While providing a rational analysis of papal directives, they offered no solution to the problems of securing episcopal recognition for their movement or of multiplying its real influence in society. These required more than syllogistic exactitude. Sophisticated theological analysis had to be supplemented with thorough planning.

The cell movement was as yet too haphazardly organized to deal with the root problems of the environment. In New York, Francis Wendell, O.P., was organizing a group of young girl workers. In Toledo, Father O'Toole continued to guide the endeavors of high school students at Central Catholic. In Dayton, Ohio, Lawrence Monnheim, S.M., was using Dayton University's position as the home base of the National Commission on Catholic Action Study disseminate information through Catholic Action

XUM

Reprints.[1] In San Antonio, Texas, the Oblate fathers continued the publication of Cells of Restoration, while Paul Meinecke, O.F.M., expanded the recreation program of the Young Christian Workers in San Francisco and began publishing another new bulletin. In these scattered efforts, however, each priest developed his own program and maintained little contact with the leaders in South Bend and Chicago.

No consensus existed on how to proceed or in whose hands rested control of the movements. No national office existed. An informal network of communications grew from the exchange of bulletins, personal correspondence, and visitation. Some chaplains who believed that lay apostles needed to be molded by a definite system seemed content with this slow pace of development, thinking it better to move slowly lest the movement's reputation be endangered.[2] Others who cautioned restraint took encouragement from the fact that in countries where it had been successful specialized action had emerged slowly.[3] All agreed that further efforts to recruit, group, and train leaders were necessary, but few were in a position to assume responsibility for defining new

---

[1] See National Commission on Catholic Action Study, (Dayton, Ohio, n.d.), 3; and "The University of Dayton's Past in the Field of Official Catholic Action," Catholic Action Bulletin, IV (September 15, 1943), 3.

[2] See Farrell to Hillenbrand, December 5, 1942, Hillenbrand papers.

[3] See "Resume," Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin, III (February, 1943), 4.

XUM

roles and policies.

Leadership often makes the difference between expansion or disintegration of new movements. As individual priests in urban centers across the country continued to experiment, Hillenbrand and Putz attempted to transform their ideology into a national program. As initiators of the cell movement, they knew that, though by definition the laymen's work, it had always been sustained and nurtured by priests. Though cell members claimed their published inquiries provided a definite and unified program, Hillenbrand and Putz recognized that these were limited and imperfect.[4] Although some cells were dynamic groups capable of planning and carrying out real action, many others were not sufficiently attacking the paganism which they saw invading every part of modern life. Urging others to make personal sacrifice for Christ and country did not solve the dilemma of laymen who were discontented with social conditions but had no means of counteracting institutional injustice. Insistence on the superior value of "grass roots" origins produced no specification of concrete objectives or of means to translate orderly cell meetings into a long-range program of concerted action. The two priests determined to deal with these problems by developing a common program, establishing better literature, and warding off the competition of general youth movements.

---

[4] For the claim that leaders were providing a definite, unified program, see Suzanne Ojala, "Dear Leaders," *Catholic Action Working Girls' Bulletin*, II (January 7, 1942), 1. For clerical disagreement, see "Study Week at Notre Dame," *Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin*, III (May 1943), 10; and "Planned Inquiries," *ibid.*, III (July, 1943), 8.

At first Hillenbrand thought that the major threat to sustained progress was the disruption of the young men's cells by the manpower needs of the armed services. He soon came to realize that the major weakness of the movement was the uncoordinated action of scattered groups of cells. As he groped for a decisive means to move from clarifying concepts to organizing a closer association of cells, he naturally turned to the thought of Cardijn. The Belgian canon had already faced the problem of action, and concluded that an annual "Study Week" in the movement was essential. Such planning sessions, Cardijn observed, created "a large perspective of collaboration and coordination...."[5] They were "essential" for the "practical discussion" of "facts and doctrine" that would guide common action.[6]

On several earlier occasions Kanaly had suggested a National Study Week, and Putz had initiated limited planning sessions for students at Notre Dame.[7] The idea of study weeks had not been fully exploited in the United States, however, for the leaders in the country had not bridged the geographic remoteness of the cells or overcome the localism of independent organizing efforts. In mid-July Hillenbrand broached the possibility of calling a national meeting of priests.[8] When some objected that such a project was premature, he took up an alternative proposal of a study week-end for seminarians. With the permission of Archbishop Stritch, theological students from across the country gathered in Wheeling, Illinois, August 14-16, 1942, to discuss the theory, practice, and prospects of specialized Catholic Action.

---

[5] Canon Cardijn, _The Official Manual of Jocism_, trans. William Kennedy (San Francisco, 1943), 76.

[6] _Ibid_., 75.

[7] See _supra_., 103; "Flash to Ponca City," _The Cells_, II (April, 1940), 6; and "Notre Dame Study Days," _Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin_, II (May, 1942), 8-9.

This meeting, which drew twenty-five participants from ten dioceses, was an important milestone in the effort to establish a collective action program. Its timing was opportune. Until the outbreak of the war there had been few seminary groups studying Catholic Action. The forced return to the United States of young men who had come in contact with the European movements provided a nucleus of men convinced of the importance of training and indoctrinating chaplains for lay organizations. In breaking down their isolation, the planning session laid preliminary foundations for a distinct seminarians' movement. The conference attached Thomas Reese, Theodore Hesburgh, and Charles Sheehy to the specialized work of students and workers and provided a strong impetus to the study of Catholic Action in the major seminaries of the country.[9] More immediately, the conference was a concrete demonstration of the strategic value of national meetings. As the first in a series of such consultations, it capitalized on the increased interest of seminary faculty and students and confirmed the opinion of the Ladies of the Grail that the midwestern priests were best prepared to "push" the apostolate across the United States.[10] Specifically, the participants affirmed the position of Chicago and South Bend as coordinating centers for the movement and showed that in other dioceses little was being done to implement effectively the papal call for a specialized apostolate. In discussion sessions which overshadowed the speeches prepared under Hillenbrand's direction, those attending proposed action to engender additional interest, to consolidate the movements, and to quicken the pace of their development.[11]

---

[8] Hillenbrand to Kanaly, July 14, 1942, Hillenbrand papers.

To Hillenbrand, the obvious answer to the problems revealed in the Seminarians' Study Week was a planned program, commonly formulated and universally followed, which featured unity of effort, authority, and direction.[12] He believed this solution held the promise of removing such obstacles to the extension of the youth movements as the lack of episcopal approval, the limited influence of disconnected local groups, and the disruption of young men's cells caused by the war. Previous analysis had suggested that "by the time Catholic Action, in any concrete and given instance" received the sanction of bishops, it was "already an organized movement."[13] The achievement of effective recognition required a reappraisal of key assumptions and a greater utilization of cooperative planning and field contacts.

---

[9] See Rev. Edward A. Wuenschel, C.S.S.R., "Catholic Action in the Seminaries," A Report to the Third Annual Meeting of the Catholic Theological Society of America, Chicago, June 28 to June 30, 1948 in Proceedings (Chicago, 1948), 16; and writer's interview with Reynold Hillenbrand, September 19, 1970.

[10] See Hillenbrand to Farrell, July 31, 1942, Hillenbrand papers.

[11] See "Seminarians' Catholic Action Week-End," Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin, II (September, 1942), 7.

In early fall, 1942, Hillenbrand and Putz began to propel the students' movement toward such a common program. Earlier they had worked from the assumption that organization should not be imposed but evolve organically from a recognized need.[14] Paul McGuire had suggested that a period of three years preparation might be needed to develop the requisite spiritual, intellectual, and social growth. That period of time had already elapsed. In isolated areas the desired growth had occurred, while in others the war had brought decline or dissolution.[15] It was now imperative that all cells "move together" in "the same direction."[16]

---

[12] See Hillenbrand to Rev. Stephen Anderl, December 19, 1942, Hillenbrand papers.

[13] See Eugene Geissler, Training of Lay Leaders: An Introduction to Catholic Action (South Bend, 1941), 34; and Rev. Stephen Anderl and Sister Mary Ruth, F.S.P.A., The Technique of the Catholic Action Cell Meeting (La Crosse, Wisconsin, 1943), 12.

[14] Geissler, 34.

Through effective use of their institutional connections, Hillenbrand and Putz began a new effort to shape the apostolate by coordinating strategy and objectives. In their view, any system of programming necessarily had to encompass the specialized groups on the West and East Coast as well as those located throughout the Midwest. Otherwise, the movement would be in no position to effect the social regeneration it called for or to become an organized means to reach large numbers of "secularized Americans." In operative terms, the development of a corporate action style meant transcending the restricted focus on such problems as dating, modesty, language, and reading to which many cells had directed almost exclusive attention. It also meant counteracting N.C.W.C. efforts to develop united action along "Italian" rather than "Belgian" forms.[17]

---

[15] Ibid., 48.

[16] See "Unfederated Cells," Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin, III (October, 1942), 3.

[17] For the emphasis of the cell inquiries, see as examples "Leisure Time of the Young American Girl," Catholic Action Working Girls' Bulletin, II (January 7, 1942), 2-3; "Example of an Inquiry: Impure Language in the Shop," Factory Workers' Catholic Action, I (February, 1942), 4: Javier Covarrubias, "The President's Message,"

XUM

In this new effort to achieve broader social impact, Putz began formulating a five-year plan of social inquiries, while Hillenbrand formalized his role as a national consultant to those interested in lay action. This informal division of responsibilities had an inner logic which portended the transformation of the Chicago and South Bend movements into national service agencies. It had the advantage of confirming the distinctive pattern of action each priest had developed and of providing more systematic contact with potential chaplains and militants. Through his sponsorship of the *Bulletin*, Hillenbrand received numerous questions, requests for advice, and notices of new groups and projects. At Notre Dame, the field secretaries for Putz's Catholic Action Students furnished the means for maintaining contact

---

Catholic Action Bulletin, II (March 15, 1942), 2; "Specific Problems Study Thru the Inquiry," *Chicago College Men's Bulletin*, I (March 27, 1942), 6; "Leisure Time of the Young American Girl: Dates," *Catholic Action Working Girls' Bulletin*, II (April 25, 1942), 2-3; "Leisure Time of the Young American Girl: Clothes and Drinking," *ibid*., II (May 25, 1942), 1-2; "Music: Jumpin' Jive," *Catholic Action Working Boys' Bulletin*, I (July, 1942), 4; "Leisure Time of the Business Girl: Body Beautiful," *Catholic Action Business Girls' Bulletin*, II (July 25, 1942), 1; "Courtship of the Business Girl," *ibid*., II (August 25, 1942), 1; "Individualism: Unity in the Cell and in the Federation," *ibid*., II (September 25, 1942), 2; "State Street on Saturday Night," *ibid*., II (November, 1942), 1-3. For the distinction between "Italian" and "Belgian" forms, see Louis Putz, C.S.C., "Preface," in F. Lelotte, S.J., *Fundamental Principles of Catholic Action*, trans. Joseph A. Rocheleau, S.S.S.R. and John V. McGuire, C.S.S.R., (South Bend, 1947), 11.

between dispersed groups.[18] Moreover the merger came at a time when many chaplains were not sure of anything beyond the organization of leaders' cells and when the movement had gone little beyond an early stage of experimentation. One early fruit of a more definite liaison was to diminish the influence of Henry Roy, O.M.I., whose French-speaking J.O.C. movement in Manchester, New Hampshire, was launching its own effort "to perfect...an organization, a method and a technique" and to spread throughout "New England and beyond."[19]

More significantly, however, commonality of effort succeeded in gaining the strongest episcopal support the students' movement had yet received. With the cooperation of the Chicago and South Bend chaplains, Father Stephen Anderl and Sister Mary Ruth, F.S.P.A., of LaCrosse, Wisconsin, compiled a technical manual, The Technique of the Catholic Action Cell Meeting.[20] An admittedly unoriginal work, the booklet secured an approval which not

---

[18] See "Review of Activities," Catholic Action Bulletin, II (March 15, 1942), 8, for a description of the function of the Notre Dame field secretaries. In 1942 the field secretary was Vincent McAloon.

[19] See Henry Roy, O.M.I., The JOCist Movement (Manchester, New Hampshire, 1944), 61.

[20] For the collaborative effort, see Anderl to Priests' Bulletin, December 11, 1942; Hillenbrand to Anderl, December 14, 1942; Hillenbrand to Anderl, December 19, 1942, Hillenbrand papers; and Anderl and Sister M. Ruth, "Author's Preface," The Technique of the Catholic Action Cell Meeting, 8-9.

XUM

only affirmed the inquiry method but placed an episcopal stamp of approval on the organizational form the Chicago federations had developed. In a formal letter, Alexander J. McGavick, bishop of LaCrosse, congratulated the compilers for clearing away the obscurity over "the exact meaning of Catholic Action" and for countering "the erroneous concept" that "all apostolic work comes under that designation."[21] The bishop underlined his acceptance of the ideological thrust of Hillenbrand's explanation of that technical term by stressing "the one general objective" of extending Christ's Kingdom on earth. In a significant deviation from N.C.W.C. rhetoric, he stressed its unique organization in a cell, small in number and of a particular group or occupation, and declared that "all over our country Catholic Action cells and federations of cells are being organized according to the official pattern." To this, Bishop McGavick declared, his own diocese would be no exception.[22]

McGavick's diocese was in fact an exception. His approval came at a time when most bishops were encouraging the faithful to assist their new war-time agency, the National Catholic Community Service.[23] Even more than the depression had done, the war was causing upheaval and reorientation in every Catholic organization. The official organizations concentrated their major energies in disseminating information concerning the papal program for world peace. Therefore, the immediate need for "serious study of the peace plans of Pope Pius XII" and of "a victory and a peace acceptable to God" represented the more common episcopal concern.[24] Had McGavick's recognition of federated cells as an "official pattern" for a "wholesome, soul-inspiring movement" come before Catholic discourse turned to an analysis of the conditions for a Christian peace, it might have exercised decisive influence. Since it came at a time when wartime measures were taking women from the home and drawing young men into military service, the McGavick letter was more useful for argumentative than for programmatic purposes.[25]

---

[21] Alexander J. McGavick, D.D., to Rev. Stephen Anderl and Sister Mary Ruth, F.S.P.A., December 8, 1942, as reproduced in Anderl and Ruth, The Technique of the Catholic Action Cell Meeting, 5.

[22] Ibid., 6.

[23] See Rita L. Lynn, The National Catholic Community Service: Its Organization, Development and Termination

Official Catholic youth leaders responded to the Holy See's desire for world peace by continuing their emphasis on social education. The student federations

---

as a War-Service Organization ("Catholic University Publications: Studies in Sociology," Vol. XXXI; Washington, D.C., 1949), 3-17.

[24] See "Victory and Peace: Statement Issued by the Archbishops and Bishops of the United States, November 14, 1942," Catholic Action, XXIV (December, 1942), 12.

[25] As an example of Hillenbrand's use of the letter, see Hillenbrand to Rev. John J. Birch, October 11, 1943, Hillenbrand papers.

affiliated with the National Catholic Youth Council sponsored in Cincinnati, Ohio, from December 28-30, 1942 a Catholic Collegiate Congress. In its sponsorship, theme, and design the Congress graphically demonstrated the importance which the Youth Department assigned to the social role of college students and the intensity of its effort "to develop the plan approved by the American hierarchy for unifying Catholic youth forces and training future leaders."[26] The special significance of the meeting, N.C.W.C. staff explained, was that for the first time in the history of the American Church college students had united in congress to deliberate on common issues. The Congress brought together 331 delegates from 60 Catholic and 118 delegates from 25 secular colleges. Its theme of "Victory in War and in Peace" derived clearly from the annual statement of the Administrative Board issued in the previous month. Quite naturally, the delegates stressed the urgent need for an "intelligent collegiate mind" relative to the Papal peace plans.[27]

---

[26] "Catholic Collegiate Congress in Cincinnati," Catholic Action Bulletin, III (October 15, 1942), 5.

[27] For specific details about this congress, see "Catholic Collegiate Congress in Cincinnati," 5-6; "Plans for Closer Cooperation of Lay Groups on Youth Announced," Catholic Action, XXV (January, 1943), 13; Tess Marie Gorke, "Catholic Collegiate Congress Makes History," ibid., XXV (February, 1943), 6-7; and "NCWC Episcopal Reports," ibid., XXV (December, 1943), 15, in which the Youth Department ranked it as "outstanding among the achievements of the college and university section of the National Catholic Youth Council...."

To those convinced that the vigorous action of the Gospel was the necessary weapon against secularism, there were reasons to question the value of such a congress. Its exploration of papal doctrine was unexceptionable, but its stated purpose of giving information and inspiration to potential Catholic lay leaders raised anew the critical question of the interaction between sanctity and organization. "The fine work of discussion clubs promises no certainty of action," claimed Hillenbrand's Bulletin. "Committees, even those doing apostolic work, in our catholic societies are not the total solution, for they only gnaw at the problem or forget the real problem altogether." Laymen would never be serious about secularism or its elimination until they realized that a "total solution" lay "not in private reading leading to aimless action, but in the apostolic education and organized action that Catholic Action gives to the Gospels." The "sanctity" of existing organizations was not sufficient, the article continued; it was not "rugged enough to fight secularism." In student cells priests would find "an organization that demands, and checks weekly its demand, for stern apostolic sanctity."[28]

The replacement of subtlety with bluntness in challenging the general approach of the N.C.W.C. rested upon the conviction that Catholic Action could succeed only through the Jocist method of cells and inquiry and upon the expectation that Putz's long-range planning could match strong claims with practical results. In February, 1943, Hillenbrand published an Australian appraisal which argued for the distinctive advantages of the Chicago procedures. "I would say," ventured the anonymous correspondent, "you are on the very soundest lines, beginning with fundamentals, trying to go deep, advancing slowly but surely, not starting with a top-heavy organization but growing as life itself."[29] In response, Hillenbrand insisted that his team of chaplains had learned by application and by experience "things no one could have taught us." They now realized that any attempt to form a movement without organization and specialization led to "either a non-militant organization or a study club or a young peoples' club." Such organizations could not produce the "natural growth" essential to an overpowering Christian revolution. An attempt to arrive at that "by building the machinery, the big organization, the top storeys first...would be ruinous."[30] In the Midwest, he asserted, priests were not only laying foundations for a revolution but had already begun to build on them.

---

[28] See "The Weapon Against Secularism," Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin, III (January, 1943), 7; and "Catholic Collegiate Congress," ibid., 8.

Student leaders at Notre Dame added their voice and vision when they announced the Third Catholic Action Study Week. The broad aims of their movement, they insisted, showed that it was "not designed for the whims and fancies of its leaders." Without the emergence of widespread lay leadership and concern, specialized Catholic Action would degenerate into a limited venture and destroy the necessary proportion between means and goals. But now "with the help of the Chicago C.A. and the JEC of Canada," the editors declared, "we are attempting a long-range program. We are going to have our FIVE-YEAR PLAN of Student Catholic Action." Lay student leaders from various fields and centers would have in their Study Week "an opportunity for a sharing of experience and conviction, as well as a time to coordinate strategy and objectives to be attacked."[31]

---

[29] "Letter from Australia," Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin, III (February, 1943), 10.

[30] "Resume," ibid., 6.

Sponsors of the Study Week thought that the planning session would speed efforts to recruit more members to their movement. From the West Coast came strong dissent. One student argued that organized Catholic Action should give more freedom by pooling ideas rather than by restricting them. Leaders with their own ideas must have room to expand freely so that Christian life did not bind but broadened the vistas of natural life. In their ideas on sanctification, organization, and recruiting, he argued, the Notre Dame leaders were missing the point of both Cardijn's program for the J.O.C. and the papal directives. "Organization is something that binds," he wrote. "The purpose of organization in CA is not to standardize...for the sake of organization...[but] to make the action of individuals--individual leaders--more effective because it is concerted." Their concentrated effort, therefore, should not be aimed at recruiting. The dissenter admitted that

---

[31] "Looking Ahead," Leaders' Bulletin, [C.A.S.], III (March, 1943), 1.

> once you have made these fundamental mistakes of thinking that personal formation comes first in the order of time, that CA programs are set up to bind the cells more closely, and that the best thing you can do to change people is to drag them into the cells, it is very logical to emphasize recruiting. In fact, that is all there is left to emphasize. What is necessary is to avoid that initial error. Sooner or later there is going to be a tremendous letdown in your cells, because they are going to realize with a sudden shock that they have not transformed the environment and can never transform it by making themselves a solid group outside the milieu and then hurling themselves at it. They will inevitably bounce back without having made an impression at all except an unfavorable dent.

He concluded his argument by suggesting that Notre Dame leaders were divorcing themselves from the people they wished to change. "More yet," he claimed, "all the programs of the cell group you lead seem to be aimed at strengthening and solidifying the organization of 'Catholic Action.' There is another mistake."[32]

To build a long-range program for distinct student and worker movements without virtual unanimity on questions of aims and method was unthinkable. When Paul Meinecke, chaplain to the San Francisco Y.C.W., wrote to Hillenbrand to suggest an exchange of bulletins and to ask the latter's opinion of their work, Hillenbrand responded sternly. "You asked us frankly for a criticism of your setup," he began. "I know you will not mind my saying that you do not have Catholic Action nor the Jocist movement." The reason, he explained, was that Meinecke had not followed the essentials laid down by Pius XI, whom Hillenbrand interpreted as desiring the creation of lay apostles on an organized and specialized basis. "You do not seem to aim at the creation of apostles," he observed. "You are on an organized basis but above all you do not seem to have any specialization whatever." The San Francisco organization, therefore, looked "a whole lot" like another general youth movement that aimed at the provision of many services. "It will do a lot of good," Hillenbrand conceded, "but it will never create any apostles." He admitted that "a national set up" was still "far away in this country" and argued that the real hope was "that each diocese will begin the work as the pope has indicated." The San Francisco movement, he concluded, had a heavy emphasis on "aggressive publicity" but missed "the heart of it."[33]

---

[32] "From One CA Student to Another," ibid., 7-8.

---

[33] Hillenbrand to Rev. Paul Meinecke, O.F.M., March 30, 1943, Hillenbrand papers. For a shortened form of this letter, see "Your Letters to Us," The Voice of the Y.C.W., I (May 1, 1943), 7.

The exchange of criticisms revealed competitive interpretations within the local movements. When Hillenbrand's letter was read aloud at the next San Francisco general meeting, the leaders responded with an outcry of protest. Their movement, Meinecke explained, was "one of the few thriving youth organizations" in the Bay Area. Others remarked that their organization was "ahead of most groups in development and more like the French and Belgian groups than others in this country." The lay editor of _The Voice of the Y.C.W._ suggested that Hillenbrand's criticism would help emphasize the prime importance of cells "to some of our members who are more interested in the social angle of the Movement." He added, however, that Archbishop Mitty was "fed up with misty eyed enthusiasts with grand plans on paper" which often faltered in less than a year.[34] Meinecke argued that Catholic Action in the United States was "still pioneering" and that "as an isolated group" the San Francisco movement was "working out a C.A. technique for youth in America." With over three hundred members, he added, they were able to carry out "a program that embraces a great variety of activities without straining any single member." To the accusation that the Y.C.W. in San Francisco put too much emphasis on the social to the detriment of the spiritual, he answered: "We see C.A. as a way of life for all Catholic Youth, not as the private enterprise of the pious boys and girls of the parish."[35]

---

[34] "Editor's Note," _ibid_., 7.

In contrast to his approach to the Youth Department program, Hillenbrand broke off this argument almost as soon as it broke out. Available evidence provides no definitive answer as to why he failed to join in prolonged debate over what he viewed as substantial issues. After all, Meinecke's program was the most ambitious Jocist venture on the West Coast. His defense demonstrated that he viewed Catholic Action much differently than did Hillenbrand. In view of the vigor with which Hillenbrand's Bulletin denigrated general youth movements, his failure to press this matter might seem inconsistent. Deeper analysis suggests that it was not.

In the first place, Hillenbrand's letter probably expressed his views more sharply than he intended. He often fell into this habit. He appears also to have believed that San Francisco's program must necessarily fail, since he was convinced that organizations which neglected basic essentials, especially those spelled out by Christ's vicar, were built on sand. More importantly, he felt that his role was to maintain special supervision until three distinct movements of students, workers, and adults were taking corporate action to solve America's major problems. He envisioned specialized Catholic

---

[35] [Paul Meinecke], "In Defense of the Y.C.W.," ibid., 11.

Action as a total movement, comprised of laity in the three environments which society presented. Meinecke's emphasis on Catholic Action as a way of life for "all Catholic youth" represented only one facet of the program at which he aimed. Even before he wrote to the Bay chaplain, he had seen the Catholic Labor Alliance secure official approval from Archbishop Stritch for its work in Chicago.[36] Moreover, he was watching closely the attempt to originate for the first time a viable adult cell.

This first adult cell, which later evolved into the Christian Family Movement,[37] represented both a challenge and an opportunity. Spearheaded by Paul Hazard, a former seminarian, the group included Frank Crowe and Patrick Crowley, Loop attorneys, together with a statistician, a newpaperman, and an investment counselor. The basic challenge arose from the occupational diversity of its members. Only eight months earlier Hillenbrand had warned John G. Bowen, N.C.C.M. field representative, that violation of vocational specialization would break

---

[36] For the approval and the work of the Catholic Labor Alliance, see [Edward Marciniak], "A Program of Action: Statement of Aims," Work, I (July, 1943), 1-2; Thomas A. Gavagan, "Five Years of Work," passim, Box 1, folder 5, Papers of the Catholic Council on Working Life [the renamed organization] (Chicago Historical Society).

[37] See infra, 324-26, 328-29, 331.

XUM

a cardinal rule and would not work.[38] On the other hand, his close associate, Martin Farrell, was impressed with the group. In the latter's judgment, the men were much enlightened on modern social problems. "Paul is a good organizer and very sincere," Farrell wrote. "There is something here I think."[39] Hillenbrand agreed that Hazard would be a great help "if he went the full way." There must be special supervision until that occurred. "I told Hazard over the phone frankly," he replied, "that the movement must be specialized. He said I went further than you ever went but I thought it best not to leave him under any illusions both for his own sake and for ours."[40]

The downtown cell was meeting weekly. The disparate background of its members, however, raised the question of whether it could ever get down to direct action on the unchristian practices of any one specific economic field. The men argued for hours over details of their faith and could not agree whether they should have a regular meeting format or conduct them without definite requirements.[41] Through the influence of Charles Marhoefer, whom Hillenbrand designated as the unofficial chaplain, the group finally adopted the standard Jocist technique.[42] Until Joe Joyce, one of the early recruits, came up with the area of family life as a matter of common experience and concern, however, its members found it difficult to establish any definite direction.[43] It remained isolated and inchoate, much too experimental to develop a basic program of inquiries.

---

[38] See supra, 155.

[39] Farrell to Hillenbrand, March 7, 1943, Hillenbrand papers. Five weeks earlier, Fathers Farrell and Runkle, together with the seminarian Rev. Mr. John Egan, had met for an evening with Mr. and Mrs. James O'Shaugnessy. "Without a doubt," Farrell wrote Hillenbrand, "they are the American Mr. and Mrs. Paul Maguire [sic] with even more personality than the Maguires. Something should be done with them. I do not know what." See Farrell to Hillenbrand, January 29, 1943, ibid. O'Shaugnessy later became a leading figure in the early years of what came to be the Christian Family Movement, but later he drew away from it because of its emphasis on a structured program. Interview with Patrick and Patty Crowley, June 14, 1970.

[40] Hillenbrand to Farrell, March 30, 1943, Hillenbrand papers.

The same was not true of the students' movement. For months the leaders had looked forward to the Notre Dame Study Week as an opportunity to eliminate haphazard action by agreeing on a common program for the upcoming school year. Putz managed to draw nearly one hundred student representatives and over twenty priests from across the country.[44] In their focus on "A Christian Social Order in the School" the students at first dealt with generalities, but they soon moved to implement the concrete plans which the Notre Dame leaders had prepared. While the priests met twice daily in their own sessions, the cell representatives accepted the "Common Good" program and pledged to put it into operation on their own campuses and in their federations. They laid plans for the publication of general interest college and high school magazines and authorized the immediate publication of a new Catholic Action quarterly, The Movement.[45] Gerard Pelletier and "Alek" Leduc, former heads respectively of the Canadian J.E.C. and

---

[41] Interview with Patrick and Patty Crowley, June 14, 1970. See also [Charles J. Marhoefer], "A Letter: Business Men's Cell," _Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin_, III (July, 1943), 6-7.

[42] Marhoefer, 6-7; and writer's interview with Patrick and Patty Crowley, June 14, 1970.

[43] Interview with Patrick and Patty Crowley, June 14, 1970.

---

[44] See "Study Week at Notre Dame," Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin, III (May, 1943), 9-10.

[45] Printing The Movement was to be a permanent feature and to serve as a training ground for future staff members of the projected college and high school magazines. The idea for the magazines was put aside until the end of the war because of paper shortages and the inability to get a permanent staff. See [James Cunningham], "Report from the Nation," The Movement, I, No. 2 (Winter issue, 1943-1944), 2; "Two Periodicals Make First Appearances; Other Publications are Coming Soon," ibid., 1. See [Robert Reynolds, Richard Walker, and Joanne Guendling], "Policy Defined," ibid., I, No. 3 (Spring issue, 1944), 4, which explains that the publication "may be useful as a propaganda sheet until such a day, not long hence we hope, as CAS will have a strong and permanent enough group of leaders to edit a magazine capable of competing with the best periodicals of the nation." In April, 1946, Today, the high school magazine, began under the editorship of John Cogley and James O'Gara. In October, 1947, Concord began as the college level magazine. See infra., 328, for Concord.

J.E.C.F., underscored the importance of discovering the deep needs of the student world and of promoting its common good through union and cooperation.[46] Unity of plan, they argued, could have no other effect but to strengthen the movement.

The Study Week, in fact, was a major step forward in the attempt to formalize organized action and to extend the range of the movement. Leaders were successful in spreading to Chicago, Cleveland, Toledo, and other centers a common focus for the social inquiries. Though some representatives had come unprepared and were somewhat uncertain about the aims of the meetings, these difficulties appeared as minor annoyances in what was the most successful joint venture to date. To those who had been unable to attend Hillenbrand pictured the meeting as a "landmark." The planned inquiries prepared from the discussions, he emphasized, would promote "uniformity among the groups" and "a systematic training...instead of a scattered effort through unplanned inquiries."[47] The program was ambitious, he later added, but priests must summon the courage to work on basic ideas in order to bring more thoroughness to their work. "So much the better," he explained,"if our C.A. leaders are the first to appear with real dynamite of doctrine to present it to men who need it so badly. To do this, priests and their leaders must not be afraid to grapple with basic ideas."[48]

---

[46] "Study Week at Notre Dame," 9-10.

[47] Ibid.

This emphasis on the difficult yet comprehensive orientation of the new program seems, in part, a strategic ploy. The Study Week was in many respects a counterweight to the December Collegiate Congress. It represented an entirely different emphasis from the Catholic Program Service of the Youth Department, which was still geared to general discussion, radio forums, and instruction courses. Pointing to both the value and the limitations of the Notre Dame meeting paved the way for greater acceptance. Rev. Frank Gartland, C.S.C., editor of the Youth Section of Our Sunday Visitor, outlined the approach late in May. "I think the meetings were valuable," he wrote Hillenbrand. "I conferred with Pere Putz before writing.... We have some men in the field of youth work who do not believe as we do in the specialized CA setup, and it is a sort of bait to them that I mention some of the defects along with its substantial greatness. I am hoping that such an approach may win these men to us...."[49] In the May issue of Review for Religious, Albert S. Foley, S.J., employed a comparable dialectic. One phase of the papal call for lay action, he explained, had not yet received sufficient attention in the United States: the preparation of leaders for the apostolate by means of the cell technique. "Lacking leaders so trained," Foley observed, "the development of total Catholic Action in our country is lagging slightly behind some parts of the Catholic World." After making this negative appraisal, he turned to more positive predictions and exhortation. "But we can be sure that this state of things will not last long. Many religious throughout the country have become convinced of the value of this new technique. They have become the biodynes of this new cell movement, have begun to stimulate cell growth and multiplication in all kinds of milieux, and even in many existing Catholic Action organizations." Foley underlined the necessary line of action by insisting that "if these pioneers are joined by large numbers of our capable, enthusiastic religious, American Catholic Action will soon become the vital Christianizing influence it should be."[50]

---

[48] "Importance of 'The Common Good,'" Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin, III (August, 1943), 8. See also "Notre Dame Bulletin on 'The Common Good,'" ibid., 9, for a review of the first inquiry under the new program, issued in the August issue of the Leaders' Bulletin [C.A.S.].

[49] Frank Gartland, C.S.C., to Hillenbrand, May 21, 1943, Hillenbrand papers.

Many priests thought that the students' new program was too theoretical to give to groups of young people. On the other hand, Hillenbrand and Putz believed that the Study Week enabled the student federations to form

---

[50] Albert S. Foley, S.J., "Cell Technique of Catholic Action," Review for Religious, II (May 15, 1943), 164-65.

"a disciplined army for a social mission."[51] The two priests devoted the summer months to the task of preparing better literature. They knew the Canadian hierarchy, like the Europeans, had recently established a national secretariat for Catholic Action. They wanted potential chaplains to see that their ideals were not just wishful thinking but were actually now being carried into practice.[52]

In Chicago, Hillenbrand began running in his bulletin a series of articles to demonstrate once again that Catholic Action alone, not any general apostolate, would meet papal desires.[53] He received fortuitous support from Pope Pius XII, whose encyclical letter of

---

[51] See "Catholic Action a Social Apostolate," _Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin_," III (June, 1943), 6.

[52] See "The Parish and Catholic Action," _ibid_., III (April, 1943), 5, which argues that "it cannot be said that Catholic Action is still in the day of experimentation. For the training and the apostolate is now a regular part of parish life in hundreds of locations."

[53] See "The Catholic Action Apostolate Needed," _ibid_, III (May, 1943), 3-5; "Catholic Action a Social Apostolate," _ibid_., III (June, 1943), 4-7; "Catholic Action is a Lay Apostolate," _ibid_., III (July, 1943), 3-5; "Active Role of the Priest in Catholic Action," _ibid_., III (August, 1943), 3-6; "Catholic Action, the Official Lay Apostolate of the Church," _ibid_., III (September, 1943), 4-5; and "The Spirit of Conquest, _ibid_., IV (November, 1943), 2-3. The series was directed, noted the June issue, to the theme "not only an Apostolate, but the Catholic Action Apostolate is needed now." The headnote also explained that "Catholic Action has a program" to conquer for Christ not only individuals but all of society. This series repeated the arguments elaborated in 1942 but developed them even more fully and systematically.

June 29, 1943, *The Mystical Body of Christ*, stated of members of Catholic Action that "there is no one who does not realize that their energetic zeal is of the highest importance and of the greatest weight especially in the present circumstances."[54] In Cleveland, William Kennedy, a lay member of St. Ann's parish cell, had earlier translated a pastoral letter of Joseph Charbonneau, Archbishop of Montreal. Putz established at Notre Dame the Apostolate Press and began publishing books dealing with the specialized movements.[55] Under the title *Catholic Action*, he published this translation as the first volume of an "Apostolate Library." Charbonneau's letter argued the need of specialization and dealt with the four distinct movements of workers, farmers, independents, and students. It urged Catholics to join these organized movements and expressed sorrow that some individuals had impeded their progress through opposition.[56] Rev. H.R. McCormick, who wrote the preface to the English version, informed readers that in South Bend, Cleveland, and Chicago they could find "classic American examples of the excellent use of the method for the student apostolate."[57]

---

[54] *Mystici Corporis, Encyclical Letter of Pope Pius XII on the Mystical Body of Christ* (Vatican Press trans., Washington, 1943), 38. John R. Maiolo, William V. D'Antonio, and William T. Liu, in "Sources and Management of Strain in a Social Movement: Some Preliminary Observations," *Sociological Analysis*, XXIX, No. 2 (Summer, 1968), suggest that "the importance of these Encyclicals [Pius XI's "Reconstructing the Social Order" and "On Christian Marriage" and Pius XII's "The Mystical Body of Christ"] as a catalyst for Catholic Action cannot be overestimated." The encyclicals, claim the authors, "presented a new posture on the part of the Church" and were "circulated at a time when, in addition to widespread discontent, a number of professionals and businessmen were prepared to initiate a response." Their contention that the organization of the Christian Family Movement on a nationwide basis was due to these encyclicals, particularly that of Pius XII, neglects the years of preliminary work by American priests who aimed to organize a social apostolate. See also Maiolo, D'Antonio, and Liu, *The Christian Family Movement: A Profile, Report No. I, From the Notre Dame Study of CFM, Background and Development of the Movement* (South Bend, typescript, 1968), 30-41.

[55] Putz had released earlier translated Jocist materials in mimeographed form through the Catholic Action Students at Notre Dame. In 1943 he began publishing paperbound books through his *The Apostolate Press*. Some time later, this became Fides Publishers and later, Fides Publishers, Inc. It is still

Establishment of a definite program for student cells did not take care of the other environments. Putz adapted a classic Jocist study, Canon Tiberghien's Pour Servir, to spell out what he and Hillenbrand had in mind. Apostles of the Front Lines, which he published jointly with Montreal's Fides Press, explained the next step which specialized Catholic Action must take. "What we

---

functioning as a fairly large organization. See Louis Putz, C.S.C., "The FIDES Story," The Ave Maria, LXVI (February 11, 1956), 8-11, 30, for a brief history of this effort to promote the lay apostolate.

[56] See Joseph Carbonneau, D.D., Catholic Action ("Apostolate Library, Vol. I"; Montreal and South Bend, 1943), passim; and "Charbonneau's Catholic Action," Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin, III (September, 1943), 3.

[57] Rev. H.R. McCormick, "Foreword," in Charbonneau, 9-10.

need most now," Putz suggested, "is to analyze the different environments and determine special procedures of the apostolate conformable to each."[58] Those planning specialized movements and determining their methods could not attain their goal till Christ reigned in the factory as well as in the classroom.[59] Mature and competent leadership within the students' movement provided no solution to the broader problems of the economic order. In September, 1943, Hillenbrand underscored this point. "Despite the fact that much of the cell work is now being done among the students," he argued, "the most important environment is the working environment."[60]

Far more chaplains were interested in the initiation of a central program, the indoctrination of seminarians, and the achievement of official mandates for the student groups than in the problem of developing a vital workers' movement. Hillenbrand's far-flung circle of clerical correspondents gave him an overview of chaplain interests and projects. In Toledo, James O'Toole explained, Student Catholic Action had received an episcopal mandate.[61] In Brooklyn, wrote John J. Berkery, the cells had a headquarters and he had unofficial permission to work with them.[62] In Los Angeles, John J. Birch, assistant director of the Catholic Youth Organization, was seeking official approval from Archbishop Cantwell in order to establish cells. "Bishop McGucken is quite interested," he wrote Hillenbrand, "and I believe a priest will be appointed to carry on the work as soon as approbation is given to it."[63] Another Los Angeles priest reported that the diocesan superintendent of schools favored the cell idea and had set aside a day for a Catholic Action Institute. "Heretofore," he reported, "we have been going along quietly trying slowly to sell the idea to a few priests here and there. Now the matter is wide open."[64] In LaCrosse, Wisconsin, Alexander J. McGavick had already expressed his intention of giving a formal mandate to the cell movement there. He now wanted Hillenbrand to speak at a clergy conference, and he hoped to discuss privately with the rector his plans relating to the movement's

---

[58] Tiberghien-Putz, Apostles of the Front Lines: Looking Ahead with Catholic Action, trans. and adapted from Pour Servir by Louis J. PUtz, C.S.C. ("Apostolate Library, Vol. II"; Montreal and South Bend, 1943), 81.

[59] Ibid., 85.

[60] "New Quarters," Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin, IV (October, 1943), 3.

---

[61] James J. O'Toole to Hillenbrand, October 3, 1943, Hillenbrand papers.

[62] John J. Berkery to Hillenbrand, September 15, 1943, _ibid_.

[63] John J. Birch to Hillenbrand, September 28, 1943, _ibid_.

[64] Henry G. Alker to Hillenbrand, September 29, 1943, _ibid_.

XUM

development.[65] In Huntington, New York, Francis B. Donnelly planned to conduct a course on Catholic Action for the students at Immaculate Conception Seminary.[66]

It soon became clear that many chaplains had been relying on their accessibility to Catholic schools and had scaled down their vision of broad penetration and aggressive conquest. They were working with students who were not only cut off from many fields of action but determined to confine their work to school and campus. In practice they were not following the true Jocist formula: "the elite for the masses, and the elite in the masses."[67] Many appeared not yet to realize that the types of leaders in the student and in the working environment must be quite different. Despite their limitations, the midwestern chaplains were not following the N.C.W.C. Forum Series. The theme chosen by the secretariat's Study Committee remained directed at "Principles for Peace," and its series of articles still aimed "to put this teaching into effect through united effort, that is, organization."[68] The active chaplains seemed to recognize that the purpose of the social inquiry was not only to restore but to create new Christian traditions and institutions.[69]

---

[65] See "LaCrosse Letter," Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin, III (July, 1943), 7-8; and Anderl to Hillenbrand, September 19, 1943, Hillenbrand papers.

[66] See Francis B. Donnelly to Hillenbrand, September 28, 1943, ibid.

[67] See Tiberghien-Putz, 59-61.

[68] "Announcing N.C.W.C. Forum Series, 1943-1944: Principles for Peace," Catholic Action, XXV (August, 1943), 8.

The occasion on which these matters received formal consideration was the first Priests' Study Week on Catholic Action, which Hillenbrand held at the Childerly retreat house in Wheeling, Illinois, October 5-7, 1943. This national planning session was an important step forward in promoting united chaplain action. Participants wasted little time on the old distinction between Catholic activities and Action, but instead concentrated on the problems of the modern apostolate, the necessity of a program, and the future of Catholic Action among various groups.[70] They found that eighteen seminaries and mother houses were studying "Catholic Action" and that cells were operating in twenty-nine cities and towns.[71] They agreed to develop a program of doctrine, focusing on school, family, civil and religious society. In effect, they accepted the full scope of Putz's long-range program. Relying on the theme of "the Common Good," groups were to examine the status quo of the four societies, formulate judgements concerning the desired situation, and then act to effect the solution of the problem or situation. Student groups were to begin a four-year cycle, beginning first with their own society, and then turning in successive years to other phases of the common good. The inquiry method, the priests agreed, must not be isolated or detached but must work "through a central program." Finally, they called for a glossary of terms as an aid to united effort. Within a year a special Priests' Committee was to present terminology which all could use.[72]

---

[69] See "Cell Life," Working Girls' Bulletin (September, 1943), 3.

[70] See "Priests' Study-Week on Catholic Action," 1, Hillenbrand papers.

[71] See "Some Facts That We Discovered at the Study Week in Chicago," Catholic Action Bulletin [Dayton], IV (October 15, 1943), 5. The seminaries and mother houses were Holy Cross Seminary, Washington, D.C.; Cleveland Seminary; Brighton Seminary, Boston; Brooklyn Seminary, Huntington, New York; Detroit Seminary; Sulpician House of Studies, Washington, D.C.; Holy Name College, Washington, D.C.; Dunwoodie Seminary, New York; Darlington Seminary, Massachusetts; St. Mary of the Lake Seminary, Mundelein, Illinois; Rochester Seminary, New York; Mount St. John, Dayton, Ohio; St. Meinrad's Seminary, Indiana; Kenrick Seminary, St. Louis; Providence Seminary, Providence, Rhode Island; Galveston Seminary, Galveston, Texas;

On a larger scale than the meeting held three years earlier, this planning session examined the problems and prospects of specialized Catholic Action. Those

---

and Marianist Novitiate, Marynook, Wisconsin. Cells were functioning in Chicago; San Antonio; San Francisco; LaCrosse; South Bend; New York; Brooklyn, Providence; Pittsburgh; Detroit; Loretta, Pennsylvania; Wichita; Cleveland; Niagara Falls; Cincinnati; Dayton; Toledo; Wickliffe, Ohio; Manchester, New Hampshire; Woonsocket, Rhode Island; Washington, D.C.; Tiffin, Ohio; Covington, Kentucky; Fort Wayne, Indiana; Springfield, Illinois; Altoony, Pennsylvania; Columbus, Ohio; St. Paul, Minnesota; and Marlboro, Massachusetts.

[72] See "Priests' Study Week, October 5-6-7, 1943," ibid., 4.

whose public comments can be examined reflected different viewpoints on its significance. Hillenbrand used it as an opportunity to spell out for the first time his view of the "lay areas of life."[73] Lawrence Monheim, S.M., saw it as a new impetus to carry on the work. "A thing most encouraging" he reported in the Dayton bulletin, "was the realization that there are at least 35 priests in these USA, who are vitally interested.... When one reflects that five years ago, there were probably not five priests in the whole USA, who were interested in it and now sees this number, he is encouraged to carry on."[74] In Ponca City, Oklahoma, however, Donald Kanaly saw the meeting quite differently.

Kanaly's view was distinctive. "It was one of the greatest blessings that has come to me since my ordination," he wrote Hillenbrand. If such gatherings continued, he added, "we cannot fail and surely the specialized apostolate will not be permitted to fail in the United States." He felt happy at what had been done in Catholic schools but saddened that most priests seemed to think that the worker apostolate was not only a failure but doomed to fail for some time in the future. "Most of the fathers did not seem to feel bad about this," he observed, "because they seem to be full of confidence that a successful student apostolate would almost automatically give rise to and furnish the necessary leaders for the all-important worker apostolate." In this he feared they would be greatly disappointed. Such concentration on the students' movement was a mistake. "I don't believe that the student apostolate will ever furnish the real type of leaders that we must have before the real worker apostolate can begin to exist."[75]

---

[73] Interview with Reynold Hillenbrand, September 19, 1970.

[74] [Lawrence Monheim], "Personal Reflections on Priests' Meeting by One Who Was Present, "Catholic Action Bulletin, IV (October, 1943), 6.

Kanaly's complaint touched directly on the differing rates of growth of the student and worker cells. Although some student leaders could be expected to continue their effort after graduation, there was no guarantee that this anticipated result could in fact take place. Even if some executive types were drawn to the occupational apostolate, would they meet the true formula of the elite and the masses? He did not think so. In fact, Kanaly argued, leadership in the student apostolate almost automatically disqualified an individual for leadership among the workers. Cataloging his opinions, Kanaly explained:

> I believe that our worker apostolate will have to produce its own leaders out of its own ranks. I believe that those leaders who come from the schools and become leaders among the masses of workers will very probably not be the student leaders but more often the student failures.... I

---

[75] Kanaly to Hillenbrand, October 11, 1943, Hillenbrand papers.

XUM

> believe that our schools prepare young people mentally and psychologically, yes even spiritually, for almost everything except the life of a worker and therefore a worker apostolate.

He concluded that chaplains must keep trying to foster the growth of the workers' movement. "If for no other reason than that of trying to get a little closer to the formula," he added, "I am going to try to get them [young Oklahoma priests] to start groups this winter--young workers groups if possible, for this I believe of great importance."[76]

Could the slow rate of growth of workers cells be explained solely by the lack of sturdy male leadership the war had fostered, or was a more likely explanation the inherent limitations of the chaplains' guidance? In the first place, explanations of the shattered condition of workers' cells provided no solution. In extreme form, such an approach countered the very method which chaplains encouraged as the natural way of handling problems. If observation led first to judgment and then to action, their own observations about the deficiency of workers' groups, unless matched by remedial action, was a fundamental abrogation of the process they singled out as the most fruitful way in which to promote a Christian revolution. If it was foolish to wait for an official mandate before attempting to widen the impact of the student program, the same argument held true for the workers' federations.[77] Secondly, evidence lay close at hand that other factors besides war dislocations were involved. The Chicago business girls' federation, for instance, had focused their inquiries on behavioral and attitudinal problems for over eighteen months. Beginning first with social inquiries on leisure, then on the commandments, and more recently on the dignity of woman, they had not yet faced the broader social issues of unionism, employer-employee relations, or the conditions of work in office or factory. As the student cells broadened the scope of their program, the girl workers had maintained a limited, even insular, orientation.[78]

---

[76] Ibid.

In November, 1943, Hillenbrand's bulletin openly admitted that priests "have not had a vision of the fields to be conquered."[79] He believed, however, that the theme of the Common Good provided an interpretative rubric which sketched effectively the discrepancy between ideal and actual situations. Brief reflection on Kanaly's analysis soon convinced him that the workers should begin emulating the efforts of the students. The latter's movement established clear precedents for lay leadership and a broadened concern for social benefit. Through a comparable emphasis on unity of spirit, on functional cooperation, and on common good and welfare, the workers could take action in new and broader realms.[80]

---

[77] See "Our Bulletin," Catholic Action Bulletin, [Dayton] IV (December 15, 1943), 2-3.

[78] Consider the following inquiries of the senior working girls federation: February, 1943: "An Inquiry on Gossip"; March, "Office Cliques"; April, "Rash Judgment"; May, "The First Commandment"; July, "Second Commandment"; August, "Neglect of the Sabbath"; September, "Respect for Authority"; October, "Thou Shalt Not Kill"; November, "Sixth and Ninth Commandments"; December, "Seventh and Tenth Commandments." The junior working girls' federation began printing their bulletin, Catholic Action, in July, 1943. The monthly themes for their inquiries reveal the direction of their effort: July, "Dignity of Woman in Dress"; September, "Dignity of Woman in Speech"; October, "Dignity of Woman: Drinking, Smoking"; November, "Dignity of Woman in Work"; January, 1944, "Dignity of Woman in Recreation: Magazines and Books, Movies and Plays"; March, "The Dignity of Woman in Marriage."

The senior federation of Chicago business girls soon began to redirect the thrust of their inquiry program. From March through May, 1944, they focused continuously on the search for the Common Good in the business world, by directly concentrating for the first time on unions as the ideal means of fostering that condition. The problem, the federation's leaders explained, was that business girls were "not aware of the Necessity and Utility of unions." Because they typically took their attitudes from employers, business girls were often "misinformed." The March inquiry outline suggested that, as a social being, "man needs to group with

---

[79] "Making the Inquiry," Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin, IV (November, 1943), 8.

[80] See "The Selection and Training of Leaders," ibid., IV (April, 1944), 4-5; "Catholic Action and Peace," ibid., 5-7; and "The Common Good, Part III," ibid., 7-8.

XUM

others...to pool resources [and] to form a union in order to maintain his freedom and dignity in modern times." It recommended, therefore, that all cell members "form a 'Union mind'" for their own protection and security.[81] In April, leaders of both the senior and junior girls' federations launched a campaign to form new teams and to distinguish their work more sharply from that of study clubs. "If through your study of the Unions, you form a Union mind yourself--you're a good kid," the leaders explained, "but you are CA only if you get others to form a Union mind too!"[82] Only extension of personal influence through a team of followers could bring about the kind of penetration which Catholic Action demanded.

Just as the workers' federations emulated the student program, they turned also to the Study Week mechanism which had prompted it. In June, 1944, Mary Irene Caplice, secretary to the junior girls' federation, announced their first annual Study Week. "Because the Business Girls in Chicago have long felt that cooperation and unity of spirit are necessary among Catholic Actionists throughout the country," she explained, "we wish to extend an invitation to all priests and business girls who are active in Catholic Action cells to join us in this first Study Week, that we might plan our future program together." She provided an explicit rationale for their decision. Such inter-city contacts were important, she observed, because "we must work together to attack the many problems which are present in our common environment. We must think together to determine exactly what these problems are, and how we can eliminate them."[83]

---

[81] "Inquiry: Common Good in the Business World," Senior Business Girls' Catholic Action Bulletin, March, 1944, 1.

[82] "Action," ibid., April, 1944, 3. See also "Chicago is Getting Team Conscious," Catholic Action: Bulletin of the Young Business Girls Federation, I (February, 1944), 1.

In this first Study Week, the Chicago federations attracted participants from seven cities and set in operation a reorganization of their own cells. More significantly, their leaders prepared for wide distribution a summary of the principal talks and a detailed record of the observations and conclusions reached in the committee meetings. The big aim in the coming year's work, the published Report explained, was "to see the business girl in her environment, to make her conscious of her status in society...and to get all business girls to cooperate for the Common Good." In the conviction that something must be done about the business girl and her special environment, Study Week participants determined to spend the entire year in a concentrated effort to break down the individualistic spirit in which she was so firmly entrenched. Business women, they agreed, had an obligation to "concern themselves with the business world as a whole."[84]

---

[83] Mimeographed letter of Mary Irene Caplice, [June, 1944], Zotti papers.

The Chicago leaders explained that new projects and services would be introduced as cell members worked through the new program of inquiries. Two leaders, Mary O'Neill and Katherine O'Connor accepted Putz's invitation to move to South Bend to start a movement among business girls there. The editors of the new bulletin, which appeared in November, 1944, admitted that they could describe only as a picture of confusion the status of their cells two years earlier. At that time, only a small number had possessed any coherent idea of the precise dimensions of their movement. In this they had not been alone. Many priests had similarly thought of an individual cell in one place, another in a separate region, but possessing little decisive influence. The picture now included a common program, which reduced the confusing blur of uncoordinated and unplanned action. "As we progress," the leaders promised, "the picture will become clearer and will take on life."[85]

---

[84] The Report of the First Annual Study Week Held by the Business Girls' Catholic Action Federation of Chicago, July 1-4, 1944 (Chicago, 1944), 6.

[85] "This is Our Plan," Catholic Action Bulletin for Business Girls, I (November, 1944), 1. This was the first issue of a new bulletin, which supplanted the former publications of the Senior Business Girls and the Young Business Girls. The two federations determined in July, 1944, that they could merge into one new organization.

XUM

One essential part of this picture was an official recognition which transformed their action into a real participation in the apostolate of the hierarchy.[86] In their special efforts, Hillenbrand and Putz had continued to assume that both parish priests and bishops would soon see the advantages of a flexible, apostolic entity, which they planned to place at the disposal of the bishops. They continued to deem it "essential" that cell movement look forward to eventual official recognition, for without a mandate the movements were not real Catholic Action. The two chaplains continued to develop and perfect their own corporate structure as the national councils worked to establish complete organizational regularity.

The adoption of common programs showed clearly the basic differences in spirit, form, and focus between the cell movements and the master plan of the N.C.W.C. Although the secretariat now recognized the existence of the cell groups, it had not changed its plans. "Catholics in the United States," its house organ claimed, "should rejoice in the excellent organizational channels provided for them by the Bishops." The editors displayed their awareness of alternative viewpoints by observing that "theorists of Catholic Action sometimes raise objections." Such positions, they explained, were

---

[86] See "Main Ideas: Three Characteristics," Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin, V (March, 1945), 41.

XUM

counterbalanced by the fact that "those experienced in the work, both here and abroad, are satisfied with the practicability of the National Councils of Catholic Men, Women and Youth as channels for effective lay action in the United States."[87] In his introduction to the N.C.W.C. Forum Series for 1944-45, Henry P. Lefebvre, chairman of the Study Club Committee, pointed to the episcopal statement of 1936 as "applicable, *mutatis mutandis*, to the National Catholic Youth Council." In their general meeting in November, 1944, the American bishops pointed again to Rome rather than to Brussels as the authoritative guide to spirit and form. "The only Catholic Action text in English which can really be regarded as authoritative," reported John J. Mitty, episcopal chairman of the Department of Catholic Action Study, "is the translation of the *Manual of Catholic Action*...by Rt. Rev. Msgr. Luigi Civardi of Rome, connected with the Pontifical Office of Catholic Action...." This book, Mitty explained, gave the principles but did not describe the methods in use in any particular country.[88]

Those associated with the specialized movements had long relied on Civardi's manual and deemed it valuable, but they were too convinced of the genius of Cardijn's methods to be overawed by the Italian's exposition. They had early recognized that they participated in a world-wide movement. In theory, the solidarity of their movement knew no barriers of language, race, nationality, or geographical boundaries. Its ideology was basically the same. In practice, however, the war had destroyed lines of communication between cell members and chaplains in the United States and their counterparts in Europe. This isolation from Europe had magnified Canadian influence. It had also contributed to a confusion of terminology, which threatened to undermine the efficacy of common programs.

---

[87] "We Face the Future: Catholic Action--Sword and Shield," *Catholic Action*, XXVI (September, 1944), 10.

[88] "N.C.W.C. Episcopal Reports," *ibid.*, XXVI (November, 1944), 13.

In November, 1944, therefore, chaplains from twelve cities gathered in Wheeling, Illinois, to agree on a common terminology for all phases of their movements. Their work had never been in close contact with that undertaken in England, Australia, or New Zealand. As a result, technical terms had most frequently been translated from the pre-war French literature or from material distributed by the Canadians. Local groups had sometimes canonized by particular usage phrases which were not current elsewhere. Nearly a half-dozen names were used to describe the same kind of actions. Participants in this Study Week accepted the glossary of terms prepared by Charles Marhoefer. They also voted to employ new names for the movements. Henceforward,

XUM

they would apply uniformly the direct transliterations and designate their organizations as the Young Christian Students (Y.C.S.) and the Young Christian Workers (Y.C.W.).[89]

In January, 1945, Hillenbrand's bulletin explained the reason for the changes. The effect of linguistic confusion, its lead article argued, was to obstruct the "unity of feeling" which should envelop the cells in any particular environment. Not only would future writings reflect a lack of unity, the article continued, but the "effort in using common programs and in sponsoring similar projects will likewise be hindered." One effect of the change was to "eliminate the word 'Jocist' for this country," but the new designations were as compact. "All in all," the article concluded,"this terminology is not only uniform but very handy. It indicates the unity of purpose and vision that binds all the groups together."[90] A second note underlined the importance of the chaplains' decisions by insisting that "the country is very large" and that "there must be cells everywhere."[91]

---

[89] See Hillenbrand to Rev. Edward J. Duncan, December 11, 1944, Hillenbrand papers.

[90] "The Terminology of Catholic Action," *Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin*, V (January, 1945), 3-4.

[91] "A Note About the Sections," *ibid*., 10.

XUM

Such changes necessarily had organizational implications, which soon began to appear. In South Bend, Louis Putz wrote Bishop John Noll of his organization's new designation as the Young Christian Students and requested him to "designate their committee and its organization as the central unit of Catholic Action at the University of Notre Dame."[92] Bishop Noll responded favorably and thanked the students for their zeal.[93] In the same month, Hillenbrand received a query about the N.C.W.C. program. He replied, "The first thing you must not do is incorporate the cells in the program of the N.C.C.W." Nothing came through more clearly in papal writings than the fact that cells "must not be a part of another organization," he argued, explaining that "your own experience would testify to the fact that it does not work out." Far better for priests to make a humble start with a lay cell and succeed in turning a few people into real apostles than to concern themselves with organizations that were, in so many respects, "mass produced."[94] In May, 1945, the business girls, already at work planning their second annual Study Week, announced that although they were not quite ready to become a national organization, as was the Young Christian Workers in France, Australia, Canada, and other countries, they believed that such an organization was "not only desirable but inevitable."[95] They explained that adoption of the title Y.C.W. in America meant one more step towards achieving national unity.[96]

---

[92] Louis J. Putz, C.S.C., together with the President and Secretary of the Young Christian Students of Notre Dame University, to Most Rev. John Noll, D.D., March 25, 1945, as reproduced in "Good News from Notre Dame," ibid., V (January, 1946), 51-52.

[93] John F. Noll to Putz, March 28, 1945, as reproduced in "Good News from Notre Dame," 52.

[94] Hillenbrand to Rev. H.J. Miller, March 21, 1945, Hillenbrand papers.

In mid-1944 Hillenbrand had been transferred from his position as rector of the diocesan seminary to a pastorate in Hubbard Woods, Illinois, on Chicago's North Shore. To demonstrate that his new assignment meant no diminution of his commitment to the specialized movements, he arranged a luncheon meeting on April 9, 1945 in the Tower Room of the Stevens Hotel.[97] Almost a hundred priests attended, and Archbishop Stritch, unable to attend because of the spring meeting of the American bishops, wrote that the quiet, constant work of the cell members represented an effective means of lodging the principles of Christ in individual and social life.[98]

---

[95] "The Latest Fashion Hits Chicago," Young Christian Workers Business Girls' Bulletin, I (May, 1945), 1. This was the first bulletin of the federation to appear under the Y.C.W. label.

[96] Ibid.

[97] "Cardinal's Approval," Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin, V (February, 1946), 67-68; and writer's interview with Reynold Hillenbrand, June 10, 1970.

[98] "Cardinal's Approval," 67.

At the meeting, James O'Shaugnessy, counsel of the Chicago Northwestern Railroad, praised what Catholic Action had accomplished and said he thought laymen were now ready to respond to the deep needs of the Church.[99]

Signs of an emerging strong lay leadership were appearing. In July, 1945, the Chicago Y.C.W. girls suggested that, though the cell movement was still in its infancy in America, the picture was bright for the future. From New England to California, small groups were making concerted efforts. Their second Study Week attracted thirty-five representatives from six cities, who decided that a magazine of national scope was necessary to develop a "sense of unity and progression" in the movement. Their publication of *Impact* could show what was being done about problems by cells in New York, Boston, Cleveland, Toledo, South Bend, Chicago, and San Francisco.[100] In their report on the 1945 Study Weekend, the Business Girls' Federation of the Chicago Y.C.W. incorporated as an aid to newer groups an explanation of the ways and means to organize such gatherings. "More and more," their bulletin argued, "groups each year are seeing the need for extra days of study to formulate the ideas of

---

[99] *Ibid*., 68.

[100] See undated promotional circular of Mary Irene Caplice for *Impact*, Zotti papers. See "Across the Country," *Young Christian Workers Business Girls' Bulletin*, I (July-August, 1945), 2; and "Across the Country," *ibid*., I (September, 1945), 2, for reports of national developments in the girl workers' movement.

XUM

the cell members and to prepare future programs of action."[101]

On August 15, 1945 representatives from all the Chicago federations gathered at their office to examine the problems to be faced in the post-war era, to sketch the world picture of Catholic Action, and to discuss the immediate steps that lay ahead. Few envisioned the immediate likelihood of a functioning, mandated national organization, but the leaders looked forward to the "real battle" now that the war was over. They concluded that the laity were, or soon would be, ready to respond affirmatively to the papal call for social action in a disordered world.[102]

Moreover, real grounds for optimism and enthusiasm existed. By deepening their programs, organizing new action committees, and developing a rudimentary form of national planning, leaders of the movements had surmounted many internal problems. Although many cells were still not in regular contact with the midwestern leaders, the latter knew where they were and often had an idea of who was sparking the effort. In partial measure, both students and workers had overcome the restricted focus of their earlier actions. In several areas, episcopal approval was an established fact, while in others prospects for a mandate seemed strong. The Priests' Bulletin had expanded its subscription fourfold, and its influence now extended to priests and seminarians in thirty-two states. In national reviews, the Catholic Action movement was receiving favorable attention. In its emphasis on small groups, the movement seemed to capture the imagination of many to whom the mass Catholic organizations seemed too traditional a formulation of the manner in which responsible lay action should operate. Instead of direct clerical supervision and control, the movement had developed a collaborative relationship between priest and layman. As Chicago and South Bend became centers of initiative and planning, a consensus on aim, method and program had emerged.

---

[101] "This Business of Running a Study Week," *ibid.*, I (September, 1945), 1. See also the preface to *the Report of the 1945 Study Weekend at Childerly, July 7-8, 1945* (Chicago, 1945), 1, which explains that "this booklet is intended not only to report the 1945 Study Week, but to serve also as a guide to others in the movement who, having no previous experience in this regard, may in the future be in a position of sponsoring a similar weekend." The *Report* explained three methods of preparing a year's program of inquiries, analyzed the first attempts of July, 1944, and concluded that more detailed planning during the Study Week itself was required.

[102] See "Victory Declared," *Young Christian Workers Business Girls' Bulletin*, I (September, 1945), 2.

The single most important factor in effecting this transformation of a disconnected body of cells into an identifiable movement had been the series of Study Weeks. Embracing priests, seminarians, students and workers, these gatherings put into formal contact young men and

XUM

women with similar ideology, background, and interest. As a continuation of the effort to propagate a correct understanding of Catholic Action, these sessions were also a prelude to programs of common action. Leaders now hoped that in parishes and dioceses in which no such effort stood out in clear relief the common understanding of the broader questions of social benefit might spark new impulses. Conquest of the world for Christ, they knew, represented an ideal as ancient as the days of primitive Christianity and as modern as the papal insistence that Christians could no longer afford to be mediocre. In their meetings, chaplains and lay leaders had taken this maxim and built upon it an agenda for action. There still remained the competition of the general organizations. However, they had an answer: continue to work with the cells and wait for the day when their value received the recognition they deserved. On the basis of a common program, national unity and acceptance seemed to them an almost inevitable result.

CHAPTER SIX

EUROPEAN CONTACTS AND INFLUENCES, 1945-1946

In 1945, a significant gap existed between the achievements of the specialized movements of Catholic Action in the United States and in Europe. In the absence of international contacts, the American movements had developed from their own planning efforts. Their members were concerned with and devoted to the Church's social message, but the efforts of chaplains to formulate an ideology and build a common program had still provided no real means to counteract social injustices. The ideology of the leaders possessed methodological rather than substantive content.[1] It articulated mostly the premise that the Catholic Church alone held the total solution to human problems. The programs spelled out in greater detail that premise, but explicated principles more than they analyzed social facts. In Europe, by contrast, the J.O.C. had shown a capacity for understanding the problems, adopting the language, and getting the ear of the working class. Its militants had become

---

[1] See Gianfranco Poggi, Catholic Action in Italy, 127-28, 133, 136, 139, 142, for this distinction; see also *supra* 123-164 for the methodological content of the American ideological framework.

XUM

the most vital connecting link between the Church and the workers in the countries where the J.O.C. operated.[2]

As World War II came to a close a new outburst of organizational activity broke out within the Catholic world.[3] The urgent needs of reconstruction led not only to official Catholic participation in international congresses and agencies but to significant new directions for the American cell movements. In the first fifteen months after V-J day their leaders searched anew for ideological foundations and took stronger stands against apostolic movements representing what they viewed as syndromes of withdrawal or spiritual protectionism. They continued their effort to foster common programs, but attempted also to implement as exactly as possible Canon Cardijn's new vision of international movements of Young Christian Workers and Students and to promote the lay apirituality he deemed essential. In the context of new initiatives from the Belgian canon, the Holy See, and leading American ecclesiastics associated with the N.C.W.C., the Y.C.W. girls,[4] the Y.C.S., and the Chicago

---

[2] See Poggi, 121.

[3] *Ibid.*, 178.

[4] In theory, the Y.C.W. was one movement, composed of separate masculine and feminine branches. In practice, it was in the United States almost entirely a girls' movement, at least from 1942-1946. The absence of young men's cells had long been a concern of Hillenbrand, but neither he nor other chaplains were able to sustain them during the war years. An article, "The Work with the Workers," *Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin*, V (March, 1946), 84, explained that in Europe "it

Federation of Adult Catholic Action redefined their self-conceptions.

In Rome, the Holy See had requested Italian Catholic Action to pursue organizational expansion and to create a subsidiary organization that would gather the Catholic working masses together and give them leadership.[5] In Brussels, Belgium, Canon Cardijn wanted to make contact with Pius XII, acquaint him with the record of the J.O.C. during the war years, and obtain his personal approval as the workers' movement began to face the post-war problems of youth. The war's end coincided with the twentieth anniversary of its foundation in Belgium, and Cardijn wanted to organize it on a larger

---

was the working groups that gave the world what Pius XI called an example of Catholic Action.... The factory workers gave the students, the office workers, the professional men, a schooling in what Catholic Action really is. The real drive, the real sense of conquest, the real sacrifice were all shown by the workers. They knew they were not in something impermanent as the students." The same article, 85, said of young men's cells in the United States that "it might just have been possible to start with some cells among the young men during the last few years. Some of them had deferments. Others were ineligible for the service due to disabilities. But no one can be blamed too severely for not starting. For, by and large, the young men were gone, and you had in industry the older, married men and women of all ages. At the moment, therefore, the young men's movement is non-existent in the country, except for an isolated cell here and there, like those in Rochester or in New England or out on the West Coast." See also Mary Irene Caplice and Edwina C. Hearn to Edward Burke, chancellor of the archdiocese of Chicago, [June, 1946], Y.C.W. papers, where they observe that "in America, the movement has been practically non-existent among the boys because most of them went right from school into the Army."

[5] See Poggi, 183-86.

scale in order to meet problems and outlooks he believed were becoming ever more international.[6] At his headquarters, Cardijn sponsored the first international Study Week held since the aborted Congress of 1939.

For the previous twenty years, the Brussels office had informally assisted other countries in establishing the Young Christian Workers. Participants in the 1945 Study Week determined to establish an international Y.C.W. council composed of the national delegates from those countries whose movements were affiliated. They agreed that an international organization to instill, guard, and protect the start of genuine movements in other countries was now necessary.[7] They stipulated that only the international council was to act in the name of the world Y.C.W., chose from its members an International Bureau, composed of the Y.C.W. presidents in Belgium, France, and England, and gave it authority to conduct regular administrative affairs. Delegates then gave the Bureau authority to implement two primary objectives: first, to promote a genuine Y.C.W. organization in every country and, second, to support services in the international field which fully respected the Christian conception of the young workers' destiny.[8] The international Y.C.W. determined, therefore, to concentrate upon helping countries start sections while respecting each nation's autonomy and the authority of the local hierarchy. Through the organization of more international Study Weeks, the Bureau sought to establish new contacts between countries where national Y.C.W. movements were already firmly established. It expected that each national organization, in turn, would regularly report to the international secretariat in Brussels the results of social inquiries, provide news of any initiatives taken on a national or international basis in relationship to labor, legislation, or youth problems, and participate in Y.C.W. international meetings.[9]

---

[6] See Bedoyere, 153-54.

[7] See "The International Y.C.W.," in Young Christian Workers International Study Week, [52], Zotti papers.

[8] Ibid, [53].

The first such planning session occurred in June, 1946, in Brussels. Delegates to this international Study Week hammered out the essential characteristics of the movement which they wanted to take root everywhere. The basic demand of the international Bureau was that new movements in other nations develop in an authentic manner, and they spelled out what this meant:

1. A Y.C.W. which is not from its very beginnings directed to and centered on the masses is not an authentic Y.C.W.
2. The salvation of the masses is not a question of a sum total of individual salvations; the salvation of the masses is at one and the same time personal and social.

---

[9] *Ibid.*, [54].

3. The uplifting of the working masses is impossible without the working masses themselves. The role of the Y.C.W. is to animate and to direct the action of the masses along the lines of its full development.

4. In order that this development of the masses be achieved, the program of the services and activities of the Y.C.W. must be worked out for the masses of the young workers and not merely for its own members.

As corollaries to these conclusions, the delegates affirmed that the movement must guard its working class nature by preserving the autonomy of its members and by remaining always directed to the three-fold action of education, service, and representation.[10] Members of beginning national movements, the international leaders later explained, must continually and thoroughly examine "les caracteristiques de l'esprit, de la methode et de l'organization d'un jocisme authentique."[11]

In speeches, writing, and private conferences Cardijn immediately began setting forth his conviction that problems of the working class and of youth were now world-wide. His central argument was that the Church must realistically face the fact of world proletarisation. "There is a new Y.C.W. in existence today," he told French Y.C.W. chaplains in September, 1945. Its former organizational form was "but a preface," since by the force of circumstances, it was now "a real Y.C.W. of the masses, not only national, but international." The training it provided would bring out an elite from the working masses. The only possible answer to the horrors of Buchenwald and Dachau, said Cardijn, was the exaltation of the dignity of each working family, in all the aspects of the life of the masses. "Not for a few," he underlined, "but for the masses of our youth and the working class of our country and all countries." He urged chaplains to avoid the pernicious error of clericalism. That approach might give the workers the impression that they "have to be hangers-on of the clergy." He demanded that they form "no Sacristy Y.C.W., but a Y.C.W. of the masses," since it was that organization which must solve the world problems of working youth "not only in theory, but in practice as well." The greatest danger in this revolutionary period was not Communism but rather the ignorance of the workers, who needed an incarnation of the Church's social doctrine and apostles of this truth. To expect the working class to work out its salvation with doctrine alone he rejected as an impossible answer. They needed also a movement and an organization. "We must realize the problem of the world-wide, international mission of the Y.C.W. for the conquest and the re-Christianising of the masses of working youth," Cardijn emphasized, "and remember those words of the Holy Father spoken ten years ago: 'This movement on which Providence seems to have set its seal.'"[12]

---

[10] Ibid., [55]. See also "The Problem of the Masses," Y.C.W. Bulletin for Cell Members, III (May, 1947), 1.

[11] "Six Mois D'Activite Jociste Internationale," Bulletin d'information no. 3, janivier, 1947, 4, Y.C.W. papers.

From the decisions of the 1945 Brussels Study Week and Cardijn's efforts to build an international organization came important impulses for changes within the American movements. Their isolation from European developments continued in the last months of 1945, and the cell leaders at first received no word of what was transpiring. In early March, 1946, however, Monsieur Louis Devaux, president of the international jewelers, Cartier's, initiated contact. In a stopover in New York City, Devaux, as a member of the Catholic Action committee of Paris, suggested to Francis Cardinal Spellman the desirability of American participation in the International Congress of the *Jeunesses Independantes Chretiennes Feminines* (J.I.C.F.), to be held in Paris from April 23-25, 1946. Spellman turned to Rev. Charles E. Bermingham, director of the N.C.W.C. Youth Department, who asked Msgr. Hillenbrand to suggest possible delegates. The Chicago pastor suggested Miss Edwina Hearn, president of the Chicago girls' federation, and Miss Mary Irene Caplice, editor of *Impact*, the new Y.C.W. magazine. The two young ladies were soon picked as official representatives of the Youth Department and began raising funds.[13] The importance of financial sacrifice to send delegates, they explained to cell leaders in other cities, was that each individual who did so would be "sending a part of herself, and the Catholic Action movement in this country will benefit greatly."[14]

---

[12] See "A Y.C.W. of the Masses to the Scale of the World," Address of Canon Joseph Cardijn to the Y.C.W. regional chaplains of France, September, 1945, in *The Church and the Young Worker: Speeches and Writings of Canon Joseph Cardijn*, trans. Rev. Eugene Langdale (London, 1948), 50-62.

On April 9, 1946 Caplice and Hearn were on their way to Europe for what became a three-month visitation of specialized groups. Before their departure, Cardinal Stritch wrote the delegates to suggest that they would make a mistake by limiting themselves to attending only the French congress. "I assure you," he explained, "that it would please me greatly if after attending the Congress in Paris you would go to Rome and make a contact with the leaders of the youth movement in that important center."[15] The two needed no prompting, for they had

---

[13] Interview with Mrs. Mary Irene Zotti, October 3. See also Rev. Charles E. Bermingham to Edwina C. Hearn, September 13, 1946, Y.C.W. papers, in which he recounts the original initiatives for the European tour of the two representatives of the Chicago federation.

[14] Edwina C. Hearn and Barbara Marksteiner to Miss Mary Jane Gill, Toledo, Ohio; Lorraine Schneider, Appleton, Wisconsin; Mary Tuohy, Brooklyn, New York; Eileen Hogan, Cleveland, Ohio; Jane Walsh, Youngstown, Ohio, Dorothy Dyer, South Bend, Indiana; and Rita Noule, Dracut, Massachusetts; March 12, 1946, Zotti papers.

[15] Samuel Cardinal Stritch to Mary Irene Caplice and Edwina C. Hearn, April 8, 1946, ibid.

XUM

already determined to observe youth movements in other countries with the idea, as they notified the N.C.W.C. News Service, of "gathering valuable information to assist in the development of apostolic youth organizations in this country."[16] The letters which the two Chicago representatives began sending from Europe to their chaplain, Rev. John Egan, were intended as, and in fact represented, detailed reports on the European picture of Catholic Action. Some of these letters were fifty pages in length and described not only their experiences and decisions but also the organizational format and spirit of specialized groups in France, Belgium, Holland, England, Scotland, and Italy. They remain at present the best, if not the only sources, on which an interpretative picture of their important tour must rely.

Upon their arrival in New York City the two girls contacted Charles Bermingham to get more information of N.C.W.C. plans and programs.[17] In all likelihood, they were unaware of two developments which coincided almost exactly with their departure. On Friday, April 12, Cardinal Stritch received in his private chambers in the Chicago Chancery Office a committee of laymen, and gave them his sanction for the aims and methods of The

---

[16] Young Christian Workers Business Girls' Federation to Frank N. Hall, N.C.W.C. News Service, April 6, 1946, ibid.

[17] Hearn to Rev. John Egan, April 12, 1946, ibid.

XUM

Cana Conference. The businessmen's cells had promoted this organization for eighteen months, believing that its days of family renewal, which brought husbands and wives together for lectures and meditation, was an important project for their Catholic Action cells. Only recently had they felt the organizational phase of the movement sufficiently developed to justify a formal application for the cardinalate blessing. The Cana idea of specialized types of retreats, however, had been so enthusiastically received that both the men's and women's cells in Chicago jointly sponsored the movement as their central project. Stritch's endorsement made it the official family retreat movement in his archdiocese.[18] On the next day, April 13, came a call for new student action on the international level. "Beginnings are always small and difficult," observed the Jesuit theologian and editor, John Courtney Murray, "but they may as well be bold." He suggested that the American bishops underwrite an "Operation University" as a Catholic beginning for United States' participation in the world student movement. Specifically, he suggested that a group of twelve students be selected, carefully and intensively trained, and sent over to the Prague meeting in August of the International Student Federation, with, as he put it, "the quite sober and entirely feasible intent of 'taking it over.'"[19] His proposal fell on receptive ears, and Archbishop Cushing gave the Jesuit scholar a special authorization to select, train, and send a student delegation to Europe as "extraordinary representatives" of the College and University Section, National Catholic Youth Council.[20] Meanwhile, the two Chicago girls began exploring the world developments in Catholic Action.

---

[18] See "The Green Light," _The Couplet_, I, No. 3 (May, 1946), and "Adult Cells," _Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin_, V (January, 1946), 53-60.

Their first major contact with European leaders took place at Ghent, where they attended a two-day meeting of the Union of International Leagues of Catholic Women. Initially they were mistaken for Misses Dorothy Willman and Susan O'Toole, representatives of the Queen's Work, the American organization of parish sodalities, which had earlier indicated that it would participate. In her first report to Father John Egan, Miss Hearn explained that the Europeans were happy to hear that there were Jocists in the United States. "I am afraid Sodality took a back seat because it is the Jocist Mvmt. here that is dear to everyone's heart and Sodality is strange to them."[21] She added, "We confuse them when we speak of the Jocist Mvmt. in America; they think we are all J.O.C." In Europe, she explained, the term referred only to the workers' movement, although many also followed the common American practice of using "Catholic Action" as a general descriptive term.[22]

---

[19] John Courtney Murray, "Operation University," America, LXXV (April 13, 1946), 28-29.

[20] See "N.C.W.C. Reports to General Meeting of Bishops," Catholic Action, XXIX (December, 1947), 10.

[21] Hearn to Egan, April 17, 1946, Zotti papers.

In Ghent they also met Mme. Christine De Hemptinne, president of the youth department for the women's leagues, with whom they discussed the relationship between Catholic Action and the N.C.W.C. Countess De Hemptinne expressed her doubts about America's national secretariat. At the request of the Holy Father she had attempted for some time to enlist the United States as a member of the international league's committee, but she invariably received only vague replies. Until there were leaders with Jocist training in the N.C.W.C., she didn't expect much from the secretariat, since the lay representatives it had sent to Europe in previous years "were obviously untrained and knew little about what was going on."[23] De Hemptinne thought the Y.C.W. girls were much better prepared, expressing her hope that the United States would now provide real help. Miss Hearn replied, on the authority of Father Charles Bermingham, that much of the N.C.W.C. youth organization was still on paper.[24] The Countess reaffirmed her hope that the N.C.W.C. would eventually grasp the importance of sending trained leaders. Another leader of the women's league told them that Holland's Grail Movement had been doing very poorly since the war. In fact, she noted, a bishop there had officially announced that, although the Ladies of the Grail could continue to exist as an organization, they no longer had the mandate for youth work among girls. The English, in particular, had no use for the Grail. Carmen Greville, a leader of their Young Catholic Girls, explained that their organization had experienced some difficulties with the Grail. It wanted to train their Y.C.G. leaders. The arrangement had not worked, since girls who stayed too long with the Grail lost touch with the people in their own natural environment.[25]

---

[22] Hearn to Egan, April 18, 1946, *ibid*.

[23] *Ibid*.

[24] *Ibid*.

The two met next with the national leaders of the Belgian J.E.C.F., obtained an outline of their militants training course, and gathered together copies of all their publications. From Denise Harou, its national president, they learned that the French term for the basic unit of the movement was not the cell, since the Belgians joined both militants and ordinary members in their local sections. At the same Brussels headquarters building, they met with the J.I.C.F. and J.A.C.F. leaders and obtained copies of their propaganda circulars. Material from the rural movement, Mary Caplice explained, might help cells in the small towns of the United States who had troubles adapting Chicago techniques. They then spent an entire evening with Marguerite Fievez, Cardijn's secretary, and gathered information about the European political situation and the new areas in which the J.O.C. was starting.[26]

---

[25] Caplice to Egan, April 17, 1946, Zotti papers.

After a brief stay in Paris, where they attended the J.I.C.F. Congress, original reason for their trip, the girls left for England.[27] In Manchester they met with the national leaders of the Y.C.W. girls and obtained copies of their literature. They proceeded next to Edinburgh, Scotland, where they met Archbishop McDonald, the local ordinary. He discussed at some length the necessity of greater communication between bishops and lay leaders throughout the world, but particularly the English-speaking countries, which he felt were now the chief powers in the world. He argued that Church leaders in such nations must cooperate more than they had in the past. He related his previous efforts to promote this objective. In a visit to Washington, D.C., he had met Edward Mooney, episcopal chairman of the N.C.W.C. Administrative Board, and Cardinal Villeneuve of Canada. Since then he had written both men concerning his ideas. Villeneuve was enthusiastic, he related, but Mooney never answered. He asked the two girls to convey his hopes for international contacts to New York's Cardinal Spellman.[28] In London, they met, among others, Pat Keegan, national president of the English Y.C.W. He told them of the great hopes Cardijn had for America, saying that the United States must take the lead in the movement since it was the most important country politically. Keegan urged upon them the necessity for permanent workers and a national organization, whereupon the two decided to quit their jobs and begin to work full time for the movement.[29]

---

[26] Caplice to Egan, April 21, 1946, ibid.

[27] For a description of the J.I.C.F. Congress, see Hearn to Egan, April 27, 1946; Caplice to Egan, May 1, 1946; Caplice, "We Found Love in Paris," Impact, I (June, 1946), 3-7; and Caplice, "The Jiciste Congress in Paris," Oratre Fratres, XX (October 6, 1946), 520-23.

In their early contacts with European leaders, the two Y.C.W. girls had felt ashamed at how little the movement had developed in the United States, especially since their continental contacts thought America so wonderful. The Europeans were amazed that Chicago leaders attempted to direct their movement by working at night after putting in a full day a regular jobs.[30] "We have received too much from this trip not to do something about it when we get home," Mary Caplice informed Marguerite Swan, her temporary replacement as editor of Impact. "We realize that permanent workers are the only solution--

---

[28] See Hearn to Egan, May 7, 1946, Zotti papers; and Caplice and Hearn to Francis Cardinal Spellman, [June, 1946], Y.C.W. papers.

[29] Caplice and Hearn to Egan, May 11, 1946, Zotti papers.

[30] See Hearn to Egan, April 25, 1946, ibid.

and who would be better fit than we ourselves, who have been here? We can't go along expecting other people to do it." What they had learned on their trip, she added, would take on real meaning only if they had time to do something about it on their return. "The movement over here started with nothing," she concluded, "and if we expect it to go in America, it's time to take the plunge. We'll never get any place by just talking about it."[31]

Late in May the two made their way to Rome. They visited Maria Corosi, vice president of the Catholic Action Legion for Girls, who arranged a special audience for them with Pope Pius XII. In that meeting, the pontiff inquired about their work in America and asked them to deliver a special message to the Y.C.W. Their task, he explained, was to show the young workers around them that they could find real consolation and peace only in the Church and in Christ.[32] That afternoon they lunched with Miss Corosi and Countess De Hemptinne, whom they chanced to meet in one of the papal reception rooms while awaiting their audience. De Hemptinne talked at length about her efforts to make contact with Charles Bermingham, and expressed her strong desire "to have the support of America on an International Catholic Front."[33]

---

[31] Caplice to Marguerite Swan, May 11, 1946, ibid.

[32] See "Private Audience in Rome!" Impact, I (June, 1946), 1; Caplice to Egan, May 29, 1946; and Hearn to Egan, Ascension Thursday, [May 30, 1946], Zotti papers.

[33] Caplice to Egan, May 29, 1946, ibid.

XUM

Later they visited the headquarters of Italian Young Women's Catholic Action. They discovered that its leaders were beginning to establish specialized groups. They gained further evidence of this "gradual trend toward specialization as a whole" when they visited the headquarters of the Italian Catholic Working Youth. This new organization for young men, they discovered, was a rough equivalent of the Y.C.W. movement in northwestern Europe, having started in Turin, Italy, as a result of contact with the French. It, too, however, was only in the beginning stages. They also spent some time with Guiseppe Cardinal Pizzardo, President of the Central Office of Catholic Action, who questioned them closely about the relationship between the American Y.C.W. and the N.C.W.C. and directed his assistant to obtain from them statistics for his records.[34]

The two girls drew the conclusion that they had a certain responsibility to the rest of the country, which they began to exercise by corresponding with leading members of the American hierarchy. In early June, while staying at the London Grail residence, they dispatched letters to Cardinal Spellman and Archbishop Cushing. To Spellman they explained that they had gone to Europe with the idea of seeing exactly how the Jocist movement operated, its effectiveness, its relationship to the hierarchy, and how it compared to the movement in the

---

[34] *Ibid*.; and Hearn to Egan, Ascension Thursday, [May 30, 1946], *ibid*.

XUM

United States. They reported that they had visited other Catholic organizations on the continent, but that only the cell movement seemed to get to the heart of the problems. Canon Cardijn was very interested in the lay apostolate in America, they explained, because he believed that the United States was in a position to lead the world spiritually, as well as politically and economically. They reported that Scotland's Archbishop McDonald held the same view of the preeminence of English-speaking countries and sent his greetings.[35] To Cushing, episcopal moderator of the Youth Department, they similarly described their experiences and observations, making the additional comment that "as the world is thinking internationally in terms of politics and economics, the Young Christian Workers must also think internationally, if they are to achieve the utmost in restoring the world to Christ." They explained that Cardinal Pizzardo was very interested in the work of the N.C.W.C. and the Y.C.W. He had questioned them "as to the relation of the YCW with the NCWC," they reported, "and we told him that we had come to Europe as observers for the Youth Department but that at its present stage of development, the YCW itself did not operate under the official direction of NCWC."[36]

---

[35] Caplice and Hearn to Francis Cardinal Spellman, [June, 1946], Y.C.W. papers.

[36] Caplice and Hearn to Richard Cushing, D.D., [June, 1946], ibid.

Their reports captured accurately Cardijn's new vision. Internationalism, notes his biographer, was henceforward to mark ever more clearly the personal activities of Cardijn and his movement, which was becoming affiliated not only with Catholic internatinal youth, industrial, and social service organizations, but also permanently represented in UNESCO, ILO, and other inter-governmental agencies.[37] He had been stressing vigorously that the international Y.C.W. existed not merely to save the working masses in a few countries but to solve the world problem they faced. He soon added his own personal efforts to the preliminary and unofficial contact Misses Caplice and Hearn made with the leading American ecclesiastics.

On May 20, 1946 Pope Pius XII received Cardijn in a long audience and presented him with a letter giving the Y.C.W. his blessing and encouraging its future action and development. The pontiff authorized Cardijn to go to the Americas and to encourage the movement in the Western Hemisphere.[38] About a month later, on June 25, 1946, Msgr. Montini, Vatican secretary of state, wrote to Emmanuel Suhard, Cardinal Archbishop of Paris, to explain that "the fruits borne by this type of apostolate are so evident to unprejudiced eyes that we cannot doubt it is eminently suited to the dechristianized situation of the modern world." He explained that the Holy See wished to see "this idea which has proved itself in Belgium, France and elsewhere accepted by the hierarchies of various countries in a way that will allow it...to organize itself progressively on the international plane on which more and more the problems of the working world will have to be met."[39]

---

[37] See Bedoyere, 158, 160.

[38] See ibid., 154-58; Dorothy McGinley, "Cardijn, Apostle of the Workers," Impact, I (September-October, 1946), 19; and Canon Joseph Cardijn, "The Church and the Revolution," Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin, VI (August, 1947), 9.

In early July, Cardijn began a thirty thousand mile tour of North, South, and Central America. After a preliminary meeting with several hundred priests in Montreal on July 9, 1946, Cardijn rapidly traversed the United States. In Boston he met with Archbishop Cushing and in New York he met with Cardinal Spellman, then delivered his message before a group gathered at Cathedral High School. On Sunday, July 14, together with Louis Putz, C.S.C., he met the staff personnel at N.C.W.C. Two days later he came to Chicago, where he spoke to priests from surrounding states, had dinner with Y.C.W. and Y.C.S. leaders, and spoke that evening to the laity.[40]

---

[39] As quoted in "The International Y.C.W.," [54], Y.C.W. papers.

[40] For Cardijn's Montreal appearance, see Emeric A. Lawrence, O.S.B., "Father of the Miracle: A Tribute to Canon Cardijn," Oratre Fratres, XX (October 6, 1946), 513-15. For his visit with Cardinal Cushing, see Caplice to Pat Keegan, n.d., Y.C.W. papers. For his two visits to Chicago, see McGinley, 15-20; Caplice to Dorothy Day,

In his general address Cardijn explained that "never in the past has the moment been so important as it is today." Young people must build a better future by assuring more dignity, more security, and more happiness for the millions of young workers in the world. In an organized movement they were to create "a new youth for a new world" and spread Christ's reign of peace, justice, and charity. He explained that he had come to sow the seeds of a new spiritual revolution, indicating that already in his sojourn in the country he found everywhere "the same apostolic spirit, that spirit of new Christianity in the new world as in the old." He underscored his conviction that this revolution demanded a strong American presence in the international Y.C.W., so that it could face capably the international problems confronting young people. He insisted that

> we cannot be strong in our international movement without America. We need the young working boys and girls of America.... I have found young boys and girls with the same spirit of conquest, ready to form cells, to make local federations, to begin here in America the strongest movement of young working youth in the world. We must unite in a great, a strong international movement to protect the millions of young workers in every country, not only in Belgium, not only in France, not only in England; all the continents of the world united by a new youth who will build a new world.

August 5, 1946; and Caplice to Agnes McGuire, September 16, 1946, ibid. For his visit to the N.C.W.C., see Catholic Action, XXVIII (August, 1946), 19; and Rev. John Fitzsimons to Caplice, August 23, 1946, Y.C.W. papers. For his visit to New York, see Dorothy Day, "On Pilgrimage," The Catholic Worker, XIII (July-August, 1946), 1.

Through the influence of a new working youth, conscious of their dignity, factories, shops and mills would be no longer centers of corruption but "temples" and "sanctuaries" for men who would make their work praise the Creator.[41]

On the following day, Cardijn arrived in San Francisco, where he first met with priests, seminarians, and religious at the Y.C.W. headquarters on Golden Gate Avenue. He reiterated his appeal to the United States to join the International Y.C.W. and to provide the leaders, apostles, and militants who were needed to save workers not only in their own country but in Africa, India and Russia. In his formal address, he expressed his hope that the United States would develop its movement, and asked the San Francisco members to "this evening make a solemn promise we will here form a great, a big movement."[42] On the following day, prior to embarking on his Central American tour, where he was scheduled to guide the first international meeting of Jocist priests in the Western Hemisphere, he was received by John J. Mitty, episcopal moderator of the Department of Catholic Action Study, together with Rev. Victor M. Villeneuve, O.M.I., the Canadian National Chaplain of the J.O.C.,

---

[41] For Cardijn's Chicago address, see McGinley, 15-20. Quotations from that report.

[42] Quoted in Canon Joseph Cardijn, "We Are the Revolution," as reproduced in "Cardijn Addresses Y.C.W.," The Voice of the Y.C.W., IV (August 1, 1946), 4.

Rev. Donald Kanaly, and Rev. Paul Meinecke, O.F.M. In the lengthy meeting, Cardijn repeated the message he had brought to the American Young Christian Workers, stressed the presentation of the Y.C.W. manifesto at the 1945 conference of the International Labor Office in Paris, and suggested that through the development of the Y.C.W. and its kindred movements, the United States must play the most important part in the world's salvation.[43]

Everywhere he visited, Cardijn met a cordial reception from prelates, clergy and laity. So rapid was his tour, which brought him to five cities in a five-day period, that he had the opportunity to do little more than spell out his vision of a new missionary spirit for his movement and proclaim enthusiastically his doctrine of work. His visit demonstrated clearly that the European movements were far ahead of those in America, but it provoked new debates over lay spirituality. Such disagreements continued to revolve around the fundamental issue of how the layman was to confront the modern age. Was he to accept the scientific, technological and industrial world? Should he attempt to restyle modern society while working in it? Or should he reject twentieth century standards and strive through withdrawn communal groups to create more desirable alternatives?[44]

---

[43] See "Archbishop Mitty Receives Canon Cardijn," ibid., 3. See "Canon Cardijn's Visit," America, LXXV (September 7, 1946), 544, for one appraisal of the impact of Cardijn's American tour.

[44] See Work and Kane, 359.

In New York, Dorothy Day reacted immediately to Cardijn's visit. She openly wondered whether the Jocists possessed a deep philosophy of work. She wanted to see a mass movement along the lines of non-participation, non-violence, and withdrawal from American society. A man who had the courage to think in terms of a mass movement, Day explained, should "get at the roots." Step by step, Catholics should work to remove the evils of the modern factory system.[45] In Grailville, Loveland, Ohio, where Dr. Van Kersbergan had moved after Bishop Sheil became dissatisfied with the work of the Ladies of the Grail, a comparable ruralist emphasis prevailed. From their new center, the Grail movement aimed to bring a fresh impetus to Catholic lay women's activities by guiding study and discussion of liturgy and social action and by promoting cultural programs.[46] Janet Kelvin, a staff member, had earlier in the year distributed through the National Catholic Rural Life Conference a booklet explaining the task of women in the modern world. Their present "unnatural position," she argued, was "but one aspect of the disintegration of modern culture." She called for a return to "the divine idea of woman," as revealed in sacred writings. One facet of the real solution, she suggested, was to create "many types of womanly

---

[45] Day, "On Pilgrimage," 2.

[46] Work and Kane, 357.

XUM

work."[47] In Chicago, by contrast, the Y.C.W. leaders planned to present the solutions worked out in Europe and "to turn American Y.C.W. inside out."[48]

In her new capacity as a permanent worker, Mary Caplice took preliminary steps to forestall opposition from the Catholic Worker movement and from the Grail. She first wrote to Dorothy Day to explain that the Y.C.W. was in its formative stages and to ask for the latter's prayers. "Together we are seeking the same goal although we differ in techniques," she explained; "it would be good for both of us to understand each other." She and Edwina Hearn would be happy to help Miss Day in understanding the Young Christian Workers and would, in turn, take the liberty of asking her questions as the need arose.[49] Evidently, Caplice didn't count too heavily on any direct cooperation. She turned next to John Fitzsimons, whom she knew was planning to use his visiting professorship at Notre Dame the following year to promote the Y.C.W. The stumbling block, she explained, was the influence of the Grail and the Catholic Worker movement, particularly the former. Its American leaders fostered a vastly different doctrine of work from that presented by the Ladies of the Grail in England, with whom she and Edwina Hearn had stayed during their month there. Much of what American Grail leaders presented in their regular courses on the lay apostolate Caplice found admirable, but

---

[47] Janet Kelvin, The Task of Woman in the Modern World (Des Moines, Iowa, 1946), 15, 16.

[48] "They're Back!" Young Christian Workers Office Workers' Bulletin, II (June-July, 1946), 1.

[49] Caplice to Dorothy Day, August 5, 1946, Y.C.W. papers.

> when they go to work on the girls and try to take them out of their environment by advising them to go around _sans_ lipstick, attractive clothes, and all the other marks of our devastated modern civilization, (!) when they tell girls that the modern economic system is basically evil and that they shouldn't work in offices, but should go back to the land...etc....etc...., they are building up an attitude which definitely causes difficulty in the Y.C.W., because they send the girls they train back into their homes to work in the movement.[50]

In New York, Caplice reported, the Catholic Worker followed the same doctrine regarding work, teaching that girls should only do domestic work. So strong had been this influence on the New York Y.C.W. girls that "the leaders there rebel when we take inquiry on working conditions, unions.... They prefer to work on the problem of Christian dress--which, of course, is a problem, but not the only one."[51]

Miss Caplice believed that the Chicago officers were in a strong position to influence the rest of the country. If they didn't give others the European ideas, she argued, a dozen different variations of the Y.C.W.

---

[50] Caplice to John Fitzsimons, August 5, 1946, _ibid_.

[51] _Ibid_.

might spring up.[52] Her basic plan was to make the Y.C.W. movement so effective that Cardinal Stritch couldn't help but see its value. She and Edwina C. Hearn hoped to obtain his financial assistance until the movement was more firmly established. They also looked forward to discussing the Y.C.W. with Joseph P. Kennedy, whose daughter had written from England to ask the former ambassador to contact Miss Hearn when he was in Chicago.[53] On August 5, 1946, the two met with Cardinal Stritch for a forty minute conference. He did most of the talking however, cautioning them about trying to transplant the Jocist movement wholesale, stressing the differences between America and Europe, but arguing also that there were groups in the United States who through their zeal erroneously wished to force the counsels of perfection on everyone.[54]

In September, Dorothy Day published a strong attack on the Jocist approach in the Catholic Worker. "I have before me Canon Cardijn's pamphlet, The Spirit of the Young Christian Workers, she began; "I wish to fling down the challenge at once...." Cities had fallen in the past and would fall again, perhaps as the judgment of

---

[52] See Caplice to Rev. Fred C. Mann, C.S.S.R., July 30, 1946, Y.C.W. papers.

[53] See Joseph P. Kennedy to Hearn, July 19, 1946; and Hearn to Kennedy, July 25, 1946, ibid.

[54] Caplice to Fitzsimons, August 5, 1946, ibid.

God on the machine which had turned man into itself. She emphasized, "He who lives by the machine will fall by the machine." Those who had no real knowledge of factory work had romanticized both it and the worker. Their insistence upon the workers' dignity, perhaps unconsciously, lent support to a factory slavery which degraded and dehumanized man. If the city was an occasion of sin, should not families, men and women, begin to aim at a new migration, a new exodus, a new flight from Egypt and its flesh pots? She observed that Cardijn's philosophy called for adapting man to his surroundings in order to get the very best out of them, spiritually and temporally, and rejected the claim that the Y.C.W. program brought Christ to modern man. She took sharp exception to Cardijn's convictions:

> I deny that Christ is present in the factories, among the workers, that they take Him there.... They are still lost for all the Jocist, YCW, CYO and Catholic Action that is going on. It is impossible to sanctify a house of shame. It is a delusion, a deception, and once more the workers are being betrayed.

Workers might momentarily be aroused to hope, but it could not last. Communism crept inexorably forward, and the existing industrial capitalist system made it or Fascism inevitable in the United States. Even in religious circles, she complained, "we are given opium when we are given that message, 'Sanctify your surroundings.'"[55]

---

[55] Dorothy Day, "The Church and Work," The Catholic

Within Roman Catholicism, lay movements and religious orders often represent the functional equivalents of Protestant denominations. Each possesses its distinctive creed, and each attempts to gain adherents to its views and activities.[56] Both the Grail and the Catholic Worker movements rested on a nostalgic desire for an organic Christian community reminiscent of the Middle Ages.[57] Leaders of the specialized movements of Catholic Action looked forward instead to a day when the natural communities of workers, students, and families would inject into society a new spirit. They deemed it

---

Worker, XIII (September, 1946), 1, 3, 7, 8. It should be emphasized that Day's critique stemmed directly from Cardijn's visit. In an earlier column, she noted that she had heard the Canon speak at Cathedral High School in New York. "We are anxious to see the Canon when he returns," she observed, "to talk to him about the ideas of Fr. Vincent McNabb and Eric Gill. To talk to him about machines that turn men into machines, about decentralization, about striking at the roots; about whether the inquiry system of the Jocists inquires as to the mentality of the job, the work; whether it does not tend to accept the system as it is, our present industrial system that has brought about war and destruction for the masses. We want to ask him about 'sanctifying one's surroundings.'" See "On Pilgrimage," 2. Her reason for the polemic, Day later explained, was that "controversy is good. It brings clarification...." See Day to Richard J. Arthur, as reproduced in "A Philosophy of Work," The Forum, II (December, 1946), 19. See John Fitzsimons' article in the November, 1946, issue of The Torch for a Y.C.W. rejoinder. See also Bob Mass to Day, as reproduced in "Our Readers Write," The Catholic Worker, XIII (November, 1946), 3, who stated, "For my money, I'll take the solution offered by the Grail."

[56] See Poggi, 112.

[57] See Philip Gleason, "Mass and Maypole Revisited: American Catholics and the Middle Ages," The Catholic Historical Review, LVII (July, 1971), 266-68.

XUM

their task to stimulate an awareness of unsatisfactory social conditions and to engender in others a determination to exercise concretely a Christian social responsibility. Like Cardijn, they viewed the social environment as a complex reality, made up of the different natural communities in which God placed each individual. Like him, they interpreted their mission as one of giving back to the environments of life their "providential role" of providing the individual with a climate "suitable and apt" for the fulfillment of his destiny in life. Such a task was too big for isolated individuals and required "an organized body, led by strong, apostolic leaders."[58] Cardijn's visit had suggested to them a new international dimension. As part of a world-wide movement, they found it unthinkable to direct their energies to the few individuals who might be attracted to isolated Christian settlements. Attacks on their mentor's philosophy meant they had to disseminate more widely their own formula for social regeneration.

In early fall, Chicago leaders could easily detect signs that pointed to the conclusion that their lengthy period of preparation was nearing completion. In the first place, there was the fact that many others, including N.C.W.C. staff personnel, seemed at last to be developing keener insights into the technical theology

---

[58] See the typescript draft of the lecture of Emelie Arnould of Belgium at the 1946 International J.O.C. Study Week, Y.C.W. papers.

XUM

of Catholic Action.[59] Secondly, it seemed that the Y.C.S. was gaining new episcopal support. His previous work with the Y.C.S. and the National Federation of Catholic College Students had gained for Louis Putz the position as chaplain to the Catholic students whom John Courtney Murray had prepared for participation in the World Student Congress in Prague. As with the Y.C.W. girls, his contingent of Y.C.S. leaders had gone to Europe at the request of Archbishop Cushing. In similar fashion, they had made further contacts, including the Pax Romana Congress and the inaugural meeting of the international Y.C.S.-J.E.C. When representatives of eight nations established an International Center for Documentation (C.I.D.I.), American Y.C.S. leaders had participated.[60] Furthermore, the Notre Dame student

---

[59] See John G. Bowen to Caplice, September 10, 1946; and Bermingham to Caplice, September 13, 1946, Y.C.W. papers. Bowen indicated that the Department of Catholic Action Study was ~~just~~ about to begin the publication of *Catholic Action Notes*, which was to be circulated privately among "a limited number of priests and lay people who are particularly interested in Catholic Action in its technical sense...." That technical sense had been elaborated earlier in the year by the publication of Rev. Theodore Hesburgh's *Theology of Catholic Action* (South Bend, 1946); and by Rev. Joseph V. Sommers, S.J., "Specialized Catholic Action Follows the Leader," *The American Ecclesiastical Review*, CXIV (May, 1946), 327-29.

[60] See "The Student World," *Concord: A Magazine for the Student Community*, I (December, 1947), 37; "Month by Month with the N.C.W.C.," *Catholic Action*, XXVII (September, 1946), 3; Jean F. Hewitt, "Prague Postscript," *ibid.*, XXIX (January, 1947), 6, 23; and "N.C.W.C. Reports to General Meeting of Bishops," *ibid.*, XXIX (December, 1947), 10.

XUM

leaders were gaining new recognition. Years earlier, they had argued that the Y.C.S. alone could consistently provide leaders for the N.F.C.C.S.[61] Official Catholic leaders now seemed to be listening to their arguments. In September, Rev. Charles Hart concluded a two-part series on Catholic Action in colleges by arguing that the N.F.C.C.S. had become "almost defunct," with "only meagre support in the Catholic colleges and universities where it exists."[62] In conjunction with the Y.C.S. and at their invitation, a fact which the N.C.W.C. house organ duly noted, the official student groups participated for the first time in a leadership workshop at the Y.C.S. Study Week, held at Notre Dame in September. Nearly fifty students attended. They heard not only the official spokesmen, Charles Bermingham and Patrick O'Meary, president of the N.F.C.C.S., but also Hillenbrand and Clem Lane, president of the Adult Catholic Action Federation in Chicago.[63] The value of Y.C.S. training seemed to be gaining acceptance. Champions of the inquiry method were not unduly surprised, therefore, when a staff writer for the N.C.W.C. conveyed his recognition of the significance of Cardijn's tour. "The message of Canon Cardijn to America is important," he ventured, "because it reaches us at a time when we are again questioning our methods in a chaotic post-war world. We are examining our youth work once more and raising serious questions."[64]

---

[61] See "N.F.C.C.S. Needs CA," The Movement, I, No. 3 (Spring, 1944), 3.

[62] Rev. Charles A. Hart, "Catholic Action and the Catholic College," Catholic Action, XXVIII (September, 1946), 7.

[63] See "Our Common Catholic Interests," ibid., XXVII (October, 1946), 3.

Meanwhile, the Y.C.W. girls were presenting more clearly the stages through which social transformation must proceed. Following the Belgian analysis, they argued that the introduction of natural morality, including particularly social justice, professional conscience, and sexual morality, must come first. Next to be injected was the spirit of the Gospel. The last stage would be to establish within any environment the positive moral law of the Church.[65] In their September Study Weekend, held on September 7-8, 1946, they explained that common men and women in France, Belgium, and England had developed sufficient confidence in God to fill themselves with the spirit of conquest. Moreover, Jocist leaders from more than a dozen countries had

---

[64] "Secularism: Challenge to Christians--Youth in a Secularized World," ibid., XXVIII (November, 1946), 10.

[65] See "Y.C.W. Leaders Begin New Year's Work," Young Christian Workers Office Workers' Bulletin, III (October, 1946), 2. The exact replication of the analysis of social transformation given earlier by Emelie Arnould at the 1946 International J.O.C. Study Week provides one indication of the degree of impact which the new dimensions envisioned by Cardijn had upon the Chicago leaders.

XUM

gathered in Brussels the previous June to so clarify all aspects of the movement that on basic issues there would be unity. These continental leaders were perfectly justified in insisting that other national movements not employ the Y.C.W. label "unless they follow the basic ideals of the original movement," said Mary Irene Caplice, who further explained that all members of the American version must now see that "we must be unified in our ideals, our method, our spirit."[66] That authentic spirit called for the development of mass movements of regeneration which would make of the Church the "leaven" of the immense mass of mankind. Another speaker argued that "some people, when observing the pagan conditions of the world, come to the conclusion that the only salvation for the individual is to leave the world, as it now exists, and set up a new Christian community." An undertaking of this type might be fine for the elite, but "what about the masses left behind who must continue to live in the same old world?" They could not be left to perdition, and common sense suggested that they must continue to live in their daily environment. Had not Cardijn forcefully argued that the great masses, not an isolated few, were being lost to the Church?[67]

---

[66] [Mary Caplice], "The Job of the Y.C.W.," Address given at the Third Annual Y.C.W. Study Week, Y.C.W. papers.

[67] [Marge Herzog], "What's Wrong with the World Today?" Address given at the Third Annual Y.C.W. Study Week, ibid.

XUM

On September 13, at a study day for the adult cells, Clem Lane, president of that federation, underlined the new self-definition the specialized movements were developing. Their plan, he explained, was to put a cell "into every phase, every level, every grouping in Catholic life." Their previous cell actions had been almost exclusively in the field of the family, he admitted, but the federation's leaders didn't intend to confine their efforts only in that area. "There isn't a field affecting life that eventually we won't invade," he added; "we hope to see every profession, every business, every factory, every labor movement, leavened by Catholic Action at all levels." Lane asked rhetorically whether laymen shouldn't recognize that at all times there was both good and evil in the world. "The answers seem to us evident, the issues clear cut, and so we have gone into...specialized Catholic Action." If the environment was not favorable for living a Catholic life, it was their task to change institutions and make it so.[68]

In early October, the Chicago adult cells released the first issue of their federations' new quarterly, Act, which they planned to circulate across the country. In their first published self-appraisal, their leaders declared that members who had been active over a period of time had gained personal enrichment, and enjoyed better adjustment to work, to family, and to the enveloping problems of social life. They explained that their little magazine was devoted to the great ideal of "a reflowering of Christian Life," since they were committed to nothing short of the reconstruction of society. Their federation's first achievement, the leaders explained, had been the establishment of a service organization, the Cana Conference of Chicago. Other fields were now calling them, so many that they needed the help of every Catholic man of leadership calibre. Their plan was to recruit and train men from various communities and occupations, so that the Catholic Action cells could go out and, as they put it, "form, on the one hand, a federation of men's parish cells, and on the other, as many occupational federations as possible."[69]

---

[68] Clem Lane, "Catholic Action," Address given on September 13, 1946, ibid.

At about the time the men spelled out their program for broader social action, it appeared that Cardinal Stritch would strike a crippling blow against their cell work. On September 24, 1946, Stritch wrote Hillenbrand to request a written statement that he could so arrange their program that no faculty members at Quigley Preparatory Seminary need devote more than one evening a week to it. He explained that he had earlier interpreted the prohibition of participation in extracurricular activities for the Quigley professors as not excluding the weekly use of one evening's leisure time for guiding the action of cells. Now he was informed, Stritch complained, that two professors were regularly spending most of their evenings working with the cells, that they sometimes absented themselves from their parishes on Sundays, and that numerous telephone calls concerning cell projects embarrassed "the official business of the seminary." Though he did not wish "to be so rigorous as to forbid leisure-time activities," he wanted it clearly stated that these priests be "strictly required" to arrange their work as chaplains in such a way that it would "not in any sense be an extra office or duty."[70]

---

[69] See "History of Men's Cells," Act: A Quarterly of Adult Catholic Action, I (October, 1946), 1.

The two priests hardest hit by Stritch's new interpretation of seminary regulations were important members of Hillenbrand's team. Father James Voss had been working actively with the Cana Conference and with the adult cells, while Charles Marhoefer served as chaplain to the federations of high school and college girls. The new restrictions, however, were quickly followed by reaffirmation of the value of the organizations Hillenbrand had fathered. Lay leaders informed Edward Burke, archdiocesan chandellor, that the Cana Conference Stritch had commended had been hurt by the new regulations. In turn, Burke supported the lay appeal for full-time chaplains. On October 9, 1946 Stritch named Father William

---

[70] Samuel Cardinal Stritch to Hillenbrand, September 24, 1946, Hillenbrand papers.

Quinn as general chaplain for Catholic Action in the archdiocese and Father John Egan as director of the Cana Conference. Quinn had for several years fostered the formation of cells of factory boys at St. Gall's parish on the Southwest side, and Egan had served as chaplain to the Y.C.W. girls.[71]

Those who had paid close attention to Cardijn's message found it almost impossible to separate Stritch's local action from the national progress of the Y.C.W. and its kindred movements. Mary Caplice rejoiced that the Cardinal had "finally come out in the open to favor us or at least show his general approval."[72] Arthur Ronz, editor of The Voice of the Y.C.W. wrote to offer congratulations. It was "really a great advancement," he observed, "to have two full-time priests who will work with the leaders." He added his hope that

---

[71] See Mary Caplice, "Frs. Egan, Quinn Named Chaplains," Act, I (March, 1947), 1, 3; "Full Time Chaplains for Catholic Action," Young Christian Workers Office Workers' Bulletin, III (October, 1946), 1; Caplice to Fitzsimons, October 14, 1946; and Caplice to Rev. Joseph W. Dean, October 25, 1946, Y.C.W. papers.

[72] Caplice to Fitzsimons, October 14, 1946, ibid. She had earlier reported to a Y.C.W. leader in London that, although Cardijn's two visits to Chicago were good, he had had little impact on Cardinal Stritch. "He saw the Cardinal," Caplice observed, "but I don't think he got too far with him. Our Cardinal is a very conservative man and it will take some real doing to bring him around. He is interested generally, but not specifically, if you know what I mean." See Caplice to Agnes McGuire, September 16, 1946, Y.C.W. papers.

XUM

Archbishop Mitty, who had previously requested San Francisco leaders not to attend out of state conferences or study weeks, would soon permit them to visit Chicago in the future. This year, he added, was "a great one... Canon Cardijn's visit started it." The San Francisco members wanted to know what the Chicago groups were doing, and how and why they did it. "Canon Cardijn called for UNITY," Ronz continued; "we desire to build, with the other groups in the country, a SOLID and UNIFIED and NATIONAL MOVEMENT, more than that we desire to have ALL THE JOCIST GROUPS IN THE WORLD UNITED SOLIDLY." Possibly they could initiate expansion. "There is a lot of land between you and I [sic]," he concluded, "but by organizing Y.C.W. Sections between us we will form a good line of communication. We will be drawn closer and closer."[73]

Permanent workers were already beginning to look forward to a national organization, and foreign visitors continued to press this objective. Paul McGuire, back in the United States again after a four years' absence, pointed to the American responsibility. In a speech of October 13, 1946, delivered to students at Kenrick Seminary, St. Louis, Missouri, he explained the role played in occupied countries during the war by the organized activity of Catholic Action groups. Underground resistance in particular, he noted, had been facilitated by the huge growth of the Mouvement populaire de familie (M.P.F.), composed of former members of the J.O.C. now heads of families. In Paris alone, he underlined, over 165,000 families were actively working to draw men to Christ. The comparatively slow growth of Catholic Action in the United States he attributed to that nation's remoteness from totalitarianism, but argued that both England and the United States would soon have to face crises similar to those experienced on the continent for over two decades. In the face of such a situation, Catholics must meet the problem just as had members of the European specialized movements. As American Catholics became more familiar with the dogma of the Mystical Body, he suggested, the preeminent obstacles to its rapid spread would slowly dissipate. He urged the organization of cells among men of various occupations. Indeed, McGuire argued, there might be a need in the United States for seventy kinds of occupational groups as compared with only seven in Europe. The nature of specialized Catholic Action might prevent it from sweeping the country in one mighty blast, but lay Catholics should begin now. An international dimension of analysis provided no other lesson.[74]

---

[73] Arthur F. Ronz to Caplice, October 24, 1946, ibid.

In summary then, the first post-war year represented a new beginning for the specialized movements.

---

[74] See "McGuire at Kenrick," The Forum, II (December, 1946), 16-17.

Impeded earlier by a tentative groping for ideological foundations and by insularity, their leaders made transatlantic contacts, exchanged literature and ideas, and developed a heightened awareness of the contribution cell members must make to solving critical national and world problems. They became convinced that the international unity toward which Canon Cardijn labored represented an effective new impulse that local groups in America must now implement. They believed also that with European support they possessed the foundations of a solidarity which transcended the narrow localism of their previous ventures. Enriched by a new understanding of Cardijn's insights, troubled by the simultaneous appearance of what they viewed as a dangerous romanticism, and encouraged by signs of new confidence from a previously neutral N.C.W.C., the inner core of trained leaders, especially those who had long worked with Hillenbrand and Putz, looked toward a formal consolidation of their position in large national organizations. In their first published editorial, "A Beginning," the adult leaders expressed a view which spoke as much for the younger students and workers as for themselves:

> What was a search and a groping shapes into a pattern.
> What was a vision becomes a blue print.
> What was hope now takes on reality.[75]

---

[75] "A Beginning," Act, I (October, 1946), 2.

CHAPTER SEVEN

THE CRUCIAL SUMMER, 1947

In the year which followed Canon Cardijn's visit to the Americas, leaders of the American groups adopting his method directed all their energies toward creating a national organization. Earlier, they had accepted as the necessary price of high ethical and doctrinal standards a relatively slow pace of progress toward formal consolidation. European insistence on the intrinsic importance of representative action called now for the development of organizational forms that could bridge the contradiction between social ideals and reality. Efforts to form a nucleus of trained leaders represented only one part of Cardijn's demand. The Belgian founder also wanted each nation to possess an organization capable of representing young workers before governmental and ecclesiastical agencies. Only national movements could provide the sustaining direction for the broad exercise of social responsibility he desired.

European visitors continued to insist that national unity was not a goal to be preached but a structure to be created. Pat Keegan, international secretary for the Y.C.W., played a key role in organizing a national Y.C.W.

XUM

for the United States. Claude Julien, former director of publications for the French J.E.C., worked with the midwestern Y.C.S. to alert young Catholics across the country to the development of a national and world community of students. John Fitzsimons toured major American cities making appeals to all groups to enlist in the crusade of Catholic Action. All three attempted to direct new members to specialized agencies of social service.

Such attempts at national growth coincided with a renewal of competitive organizing efforts. The war years had put an effective stop to the work of organizing the National Catholic Youth Council, but that project was taken up again in the spring of 1947. The N.C.W.C. had scheduled no national meeting of diocesan youth directors since November, 1942, but the great number of official international Catholic congresses and conferences in 1946 prompted Archbishop Cushing to push once more for coordination of approved Catholic youth groups. Shortly thereafter, N.C.W.C. officials demanded that no national committee or councils be formed without their approval and consultation. In response, the European leaders made preliminary attempts to resolve the thorny problem of the episcopal mandate. Their plans required national movements, but the papal terminology created theological guidelines which could, and sometimes did, obstruct independent lay initiative.

XUM

The key event which captured the attention of the cell movement was the first International Y.C.W. Congress and Study Week, scheduled to meet in Montreal, June 22-29, 1947. It provided both the rationale and the means for national unity. Despite some progress in the adult and student movements, it was the girls' branch of the Young Christian Workers, particularly the permanent workers in Chicago, that bore the burden of forming the first national organization. When Mary Caplice and Edwina Hearn first leaned in late 1946 of the Montreal Congress, they immediately saw it as an opportunity to develop, in structural form, the national unity for which they had been calling. With the aid of Pat Keegan and other English leaders, they succeeded in establishing by early July, 1947, a national structure for the workers' movement. This first success set a precedent for the three autonomous lay organizations which later developed.

At the very outset the Chicago leaders pressed for cooperation between cities. Their first attempt to settle definitively the basic characteristics of the Young Christian Workers was a partial failure. Members of cells in other cities showed great reluctance to accept the program of social inquiries they had prepared. Their solution was to drop the demand for a common program. "Those who want to use our inquiries will do so," Mary Caplice wrote to the London Y.C.W. officers. "Some of them will take the general theme and adapt it. Others will go along on something else."[1] The problem, she noted, was that other cities resented the leadership the Chicago federation tried to exert. Arguing the advantages of their program could lead only to friction; therefore, Caplice and Hearn determined to pursue regional diplomacy.

Under the first Chicago plan, its federation would receive from each city reports analyzing the inquiries chosen, the reason for the choice, and the concrete results. Their leaders would tabulate the information and distribute the findings to all the American groups. In this way, the argument ran, everyone would know what the others were doing. After approximately four months, groups in various sections of the United States would meet, compare experiences, and suggest points for the following year's program. Such collaboration, involving for the first time a precise geographical division, would "foster sectional cooperation which is necessary and be a start for real national unity."[2]

Just as they started this plan, the Chicago leaders learned of the Montreal Congress.[3] From Victor Villeneuve, O.M.I., Canadian J.O.C. Chaplain, they secured the position of liaison agents for the United

---

[1] Mary Irene Caplice to Kevin Muir, October, 1, 1946, Y.C.W. papers.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Interview with Mrs. Mary Zotti, September, 18, 1971.

States, charged with the responsibility not only of promoting regional meetings but of surveying the status of the Y.C.W. movement throughout the nation.[4] In a letter of January 11, 1947 to all local leaders of the girls' branch, Caplice and Hearn explained that they had no exact details on the provisions Canadian Jocists were making for the nation's representation at the Congress. "If they permit us a restricted number of delegates (unofficial delegates, of course, because we have no national organization)," they observed, "we shall have to get together on a fair distribution of delegates throughout the country."[5] They suggested a procedure and a schedule of deadlines, but added that "the ideas herein suggested are not binding in any way." If for some reason, a group did not wish to cooperate with other cities, it had only to indicate its objections. Arbitrary regions were to be set up, but they would be "only temporary unless the leaders themselves" wished to continue meeting at intervals "for mutual help and inspiration." Any city would be free to meet with a region different from that to which they were assigned. All groups, moreover, would be free "to follow the common program or work out a different program of their own,

---

[4] See Edwina Hearn to Rev. Victor Villeneuve, January 4, 1947, Y.C.W. papers.

[5] Hearn and Caplice to "Dear Y.C.W. Leader:" January 11, 1947, ibid. This two-page letter was sent to all girl leaders in the United States of whom they knew.

XUM

as they see fit."[6] With the letter the Chicago Federation distributed a five-page questionnaire. Its purpose was to enable each girls' cell in the country to become better acquainted with the development of the movement in the United States.[7]

Twenty-one of the thirty-five cities and towns in which Young Christian Worker cells were known to exist responded to the questionnaire. Forty-nine cells existed, comprising a total of 280 militants, 311 team members, and 1310 general members. Campaigns and services initiated by these groups had influenced an estimated 6,500 young women, even though approximately half the cells had been organized one year or less. Social inquiries over the previous six months appeared to follow several patterns. Half the groups followed a yearly plan, and the others either planned their inquiries for three or six months or followed no regular order, taking whatever problem seemed most important at any particular time. Approximately half the cells based their inquiries on the material drawn up at the annual Study Week in Chicago. Only half the cities had organized permanent services, consisting mostly in series of lectures and discussion to prepare girls for marriage, that is, Pre-Cana Conferences. Groups in other cities were distributing good reading material, sending food and clothing to Europe, campaigning against bad language, indecent literature and movies, particularly through support for the Legion of Decency. Eleven cities had taken inquiries on work and working conditions in the last six months.[8]

---

[6] Ibid.

[7] See Y.C.W. Questionnaire, 1, Y.C.W. papers.

The two Chicago leaders designed and used the questionnaire as an instrument of national unity. Although many of the young women's groups seemed more concerned with moral or spiritual dangers than with the social problems to which their rhetoric continually pointed, Mary Caplice and Edwina Hearn merely conceded that many groups were new and were groping blindly for an understanding of the movement and how it should function. Most respondents found the idea of holding a Study Week planned by a committee of regional leaders appealing. Such acceptance, the two concluded, represented a "general feeling that cooperation among leaders throughout the country is necessary" so that new and isolated cells could "benefit from the experience of more well-established groups" and, through the exchange of ideas and the development of a common program, have "a greater impact on our common problems."[9] They concluded, moreover, that regional meetings must take place, even though individual circumstances and travel difficulties presented obstacles. The Montreal Study Week was to them "a providential motive" for bringing the nation's leaders together. "Although we have much pioneering ahead of us," they emphasized, "we cannot wait until we are perfected as local cells before we think of working together with other cities," precisely because that condition was "impossible unless we realize we are part of a world-wide movement."[10]

---

[8] See _Report on Present Status of Y.C.W. Girls in United States_, 1, 6, 13-14, _ibid_.

[9] _Ibid_., 22.

Leaders of the students' movement similarly used the argument of a developing world community as the basis for the development and extension of the Young Christian Students. On January 3, 1947, chaplains and moderators from seven states met in River Forest, Illinois, to develop, if not a national, at least a more tightly organized midwestern movement. They examined "the broad principles that should govern the YCS movement in the United States," and formed for the first time an organized program committee to maintain contact between colleges. Participants differentiated the college and high school movements in order to distribute responsibilities more evenly among leaders at both levels. They agreed that the student apostolate was to be institutional, not merely personal, and settled upon a broader program of publications. The collegians emulated the workers' initiative by distributing a questionnaire to various Y.C.S. sections, whose responses they planned to use as the basis for specific reports on the movement's status and the problems of campus organizations.[11]

---

[10] Ibid.

In South Bend, Louis Putz and the Notre Dame leaders attempted to prod American Catholics to a wider vision of their opportunities. In January, Claude Julien, a French J.E.C. leader, came to Notre Dame for graduate studies in political science.[12] In that same month, Putz and his lay associates began preparing a regular column, under the heading "Action, Inc.," for the national edition of Our Sunday Visitor.[13] In student affairs, the columnists riveted their attention on the proposed National Student Association, a representative body designed to speak for American students on the international level.

A national body of students, argued South Bend's Jim Cunningham, indicated "that there exists today in the United States a national student community." He concluded that a vitalized American student community would contribute greatly to the common good of the United States, declaring that "the Catholic student is not doing his job if he fails to make his contribution to the student world."[14] Martin McLaughlin, long a Y.C.S. leader, and now the executive secretary of the N.C.W.C.'s Joint Committee on Student Action, wrote that "the student community, national and international, is organizing." Those who had travelled to Europe the previous summer could vouch for that fact. In all regions of the world, McLaughlin explained, the Marxists were seeking to consolidate the potential force of youth, especially students. Recent events suggested that Catholic students had a golden opportunity. "We must seize what is offered now," he emphasized, "and train intensively for the future." Success in that training, however, would come only if Catholics accepted the plain fact that they were responsible for and to their environment.[15]

---

[11] See "CA Students Have Been Thinking," College Girls' Bulletin, March, 1947, 4-5; and Sister Mary Herman, S.S.N.D., History of the Toledo Y.C.S. Movement, 3.

[12] See "Concord's Contributors for October," Concord, Vol. I, No. 1 (October, 1947), 48.

[13] See Louis Putz, C.S.C., "Our Credo," Our Sunday Visitor, January 12, 1947, 7, for the purpose of "Action, Inc."

The Y.C.S. leaders wanted American Catholics to unite with others to plan an intelligent, vigorous, and Christian national student organization,[16] but their perspective coincided only in part with the official views. At the Boston convention of the National Catholic Education Association, McLaughlin recounted for the educators the attempt of the N.C.W.C.'s "Operation University." He argued for greater solidarity and liaison among Catholics at future international meetings. "It seems to us that this international collaboration is a part of the lay apostolate of the Catholic student," he explained, "and we hope there will be Catholic students attending international meetings this summer, who will return in the fall to carry on and expand the work."[17] The guideposts to follow in relating to the fast-forming international student community as well as the national one in the United States, he suggested, were Christian friendship, collaboration, defense, and formation.[18] Frederick J. Dougherty, professor at LaSalle College, Philadelphia, followed different guideposts in his panel presentation. He reported that an N.C.E.A. committee had informed Archbishop Cushing that the National Federation of Catholic College Students was not achieving its purposes. Administrators and faculty in various Catholic colleges did not understand the federation. Many students also did not grasp its purposes and program, so that the organization exhibited

---

[14] Jim Cunningham, "College Students on the Move," ibid, February 2, 1947, 7.

[15] Martin M. McLaughlin, "An International Union of Students," ibid, March 16, 1947, 7.

[16] See Cunningham, 7.

---

[17] Martin M. McLaughlin, "Catholic College Students in International Student Affairs," The National Catholic Educational Association Bulletin, XLIV (August, 1947), 241.

[18] Ibid.

"a vagueness and looseness in organizational ties and coordinated action."[19] Dougherty argued that "N.F.C.C.S. work" was actually "Catholic Action in the technical sense of the term," but admitted that "the Catholic Action aspects" of the federation left something to be desired. The basic reason, he observed, was the great deal of confusion as to what Catholic Action really was. Quite often, he suggested, activity by Catholics was "very wrongly considered to be necessarily Catholic Action." Dispelling this confusion was "an enormous task," but was necessary as "a first step in the achievement of C.A."[20]

In early April, proponents of specialized lay action did not view the spring N.C.W.C. conferences as a real threat to their plans. Father John Fitzsimons, for instance, visited Chicago to discuss with Mary Caplice the prospects and obstacles. He suggested that the Y.C.W. leaders explain their movement exactly in a pamphlet the N.C.W.C. could distribute. He thought such a project would help to "spread the right ideas."[21] Three reasons convinced the permanent workers to undertake the task. In the first place, they thought the

---

[19] Frederick J. Dougherty, "The N.F.C.C.S. and the N.C.E.A.," in ibid., 225.

[20] Ibid., 226-27.

[21] Caplice to Marguerite Fievez, April 9, 1947, Y.C.W. papers.

XUM

boy's movement was coming along very well.[22] Secondly, they believed that American bishops were becoming interested. Seminarians and priests were getting episcopal permissions for their 1947 Study Weeks. "That is a good sign," Caplice notified London's Anne Kelleher. "Before this, they were always held unofficially."[23] Lastly, there was the case of the adult federations.

In his capacity as Cardinal Stritch's advisor, Msgr. Edward Burke had asked the adult groups to take charge of the planning, promotion, and organization of the annual National Catholic Conference on Family Life. Stritch had invited the N.C.W.C.'s Family Life

---

[22] Ibid.; Caplice to Anne Kelleher, April 9, 1947; Caplice to Anthony Laurano, April 9, 1947; Hearn to Madeline Maille, March 27, 1947, Y.C.W. papers; and "High School Boys," Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin, V (May, 1947), 155-57.

[23] Caplice to Anne Kelleher, April 9, 1947, Y.C.W. papers. The Montreal Study Week for seminarians was held at Brebeouf College, Montreal, June 23-28, 1947, with the approval of Archbishop John Mitty and the Canadian Episcopal Committee of Catholic Action. The Fifth Annual Catholic Action Study Week for Priests, held at Notre Dame from August 4-8, 1947, and described below, had the episcopal patronage of Archbishop Mitty and the permission of Bishop John Noll. With the approval and blessing of the Most Reverend Edward D. Howard, Archbishop of Portland, Oregon, the West Coast Seminarians' Catholic Action Week convened from August 15-18, 1947 at St. Mary's Boys' Home, Huber, Oregon. For impressions of the seminarians' meetings, see Frank Kennard, "Portland Report," The Forum: Seminarians' Bulletin, III (November, 1947), 42-43; William J. Morrisey, S.M., "Study Week Impressions: Montreal Summaries," ibid., III (December, 1947), 47-50, 58; and "Study Weeks," ibid., III (January-February, 1948), 75-76. The staff members in Chicago were aware that these weeks were receiving official approval as early as April, perhaps earlier.

XUM

Bureau, headed by Edgar Schmiedeler, O.S.B., to hold its conference in Chicago's Stevens Hotel. Burke told the men's and women's cells that their actions to date had inspired his confidence, and he asked them in collaboration with the other federations to enlist attendance, publicize the programs, and handle the physical details.[24] As a result, the federations were well represented on the speaking program. More important, however, the adult leaders editorialized, was the recognition they received. "In the past," they explained, "we initiated a project and then sought the Cardinal's approval. In this, with the Cardinal as host, the project is his. There is signal recognition in this direction of his.... There is responsibility here. Yes, and the opportunity for which we have been seeking."[25]

In the long run, the success of the Chicago lay groups in promoting the Family Life Conference was to exacerbate their rivalry with the N.C.W.C. Schmiedeler became exasperated by lay preemption of the planning for the meeting. The involvement of the adult groups led to serious problems with the Family Life Bureau, and their leaders later learned that the Benedictine director wanted to make his Bureau the comprehensive instrument

---

[24] See "Cells on Family Life Program," Act, I (March, 1947), 1.

[25] "Chance for Action," ibid., 2.

XUM

of the family life apostolate.[26] He later battled the Cana Conference as a deviant movement which obstructed the "official" episcopal program.[27] In April, however, the Chicago lay leaders were not aware that Schmiedeler did not share the positive reactions of local church officials. Mary Caplice informed Marguerite Fievez, Cardijn's secretary, that "the Conference was very successful and the Cardinal was most pleased. We are very happy about this, because someday we want the Cardinal to give us his official mandate. He is slow to act but the more he sees we can do things, the sooner he'll come around."[28]

Leaders in England felt that the young men in Chicago had the task of establishing the genuine Y.C.W. in the United States,[29] but other church officials set forth a different conclusion. The First National Conference on Catholic Youth Work met in Cleveland, May 19-21, to discuss the theme "Unity in the Youth Apostolate. When he called together the eight hundred clerical and lay participants, Archbishop Cushing stated that the years of war had passed and that "youth programs and organizations outside of and within the Church are resuming their normal role in American life."[30] William McManus, representative of the N.C.W.C. Education Department, established the continuity with the earlier N.C.W.C. efforts when he offered a controversial plan "to coordinate all diocesan youth programs."[31] In his own contribution to the conference, Hillenbrand pointed to the insufficiency of diocesan programs which "glorified the boxing gloves" or other forms of athletic competition as the most effective means of attaching young people to the Church. He elaborated forcefully the perspective of Catholic Action, whose approach flowed from existing social conditions. This approach, his argument ran, was "forced upon us" for the simple reason that "no other effective way" existed for those who wanted to come to grips with social problems.[32]

---

[26] Interview with Patrick and Patty Crowley, June 14, 1970.

[27] See Samuel Cardinal Stritch to Hillenbrand, December 12, 1952, Hillenbrand papers.

[28] Caplice to Fievez, April 9, 1947, Y.C.W. papers.

[29] See Kevin Muir to Caplice and Hearn, January 17, 1947, *ibid*.

At nearly the same time leaders of the new Eastern region of the Young Christian Workers accepted in New York City the goal of national unity.[33] In an inter-regional meeting in New York City, June 6-7, 1947, the Chicago and New York leaders settled the remaining details for American participation in the Montreal Study Week. They elected the delegates and observers and determined that Viola Brennan should make the address on "Women" which the International Bureau had scheduled. They agreed also that New York's program of inquiries was so "basic" that it could "cover other programs presented."[34] In the interests of unity, Edwina Hearn acquiesced in the compromise, suggesting that the New York program "fit in" with the one Chicago sponsored.[35] The participants also discussed the preparations for their own National Study Week, chose the speakers, and appointed discussion leaders.[36] Meanwhile, Pat Keegan, international Y.C.W. secretary, notified Mary Caplice that he planned to come to the United States with Hillenbrand and Fitzsimons after the Montreal Congress.[37] In response, she explained the delicacy required in their liaison work. "It has been difficult, Caplice observed, "because we have no national organization and in the matter of getting delegates we had to work with kid gloves. Things are lining up pretty well, now."[38]

---

[30] Quoted in J.C.S.A. Newsletter, I (April 9, 1947), 3, Y.C.S. papers.

[31] "National Youth Conference," Catholic Action, XXIX (June, 1947), 9.

[32] Hillenbrand, "Notes for National Conference on Catholic Youth Work, May 19-21," Hillenbrand papers.

[33] See Minutes of the Eastern Regional Meeting, Y.C.W. Headquarters, 1335 2nd Ave., New York, May 18, 1947, Y.C.W. papers.

---

[34] See Minutes of the Inter-Regional Meeting, June 6-7, 1947, Zotti papers.

[35] *Ibid.*, 1.

[36] *Ibid.*, 3, 5.

[37] Keegan to Caplice, May 30, 1947, Y.C.W. papers.

On June 10, 1947 four leaders of the French-speaking J.O.C. in Manchester, New Hampshire, circulated to all delegates to the Montreal Study Week a forthright criticism of the workers' movement. "Feeling as we do about the Y.C.W.," they began, "it is understandable that we should have become gravely concerned at the present trend of the Movement in the United States. We believe that certain deviations from basic principles of Catholic Action have been introduced here, and that these deviations are responsible for the lack of progress so far shown by American Y.C.W."[39] Although some of the groups had been in existence from five to seven years, they charged, the influence of the Y.C.W. in the working world was "practically nil." The "'action' part" of its program had been negligible and "concerned with things of little moment." And the causes of failure, they argued, were relatively clear. In the first place, although the majority of all workers were employed in shops, factories and mills, only a few members of the Young Christian Workers were drawn from that occupational environment. Secondly, the male section of the movement which should be its leading element was practically nonexistent. Even more significant was the deviation from the proper interaction of chaplains and militants. All went well when both understood their role. "Yet how often has it come to pass," asked the four complainants, "that tbe ecclesiastical assistant of a group becomes in effect the general manager of all its activities?" The central problem, however, was that American leaders had looked to the Canadian J.O.C. as a model, and that organization had itself "deviated during the past eight years" by becoming a "tutored J.O.C." with the laity relegated to the role of "leaders by proxy."[40]

---

[38] Caplice to Keegan, June 4, 1947, ibid.

[39] Paul E. Demers, Mike Gendron, Frank Lamarre, and Lorraine Noel to "Dear Fellow-Workers in Christ," June 10, 1947, ibid.

So faithfully had American leaders copied their model that "the deviations observed in the organization of our Y.C.W. are, in the main, the results of the Canadian influence." The task of building a strong movement must rest in the hands of the laity. If it were to bring the message of Christ into those places where priests had no access, the Manchester critics argued, "it must at all costs remain efficiently and materially laic."[41] The aim of the Manchester letter was to interject again a systematic ideology as the basis for understanding and guiding the institutional development of the Young Christian Workers. They pointed out that the principles of Pope Pius XI defined the chaplain as the

---

[40] Ibid.

[41] Ibid.

"ecclesiastical assistant." In the preparation of social inquiries, however, priests seemed to be taking a role on the executive level. The result, claimed the New Englanders, was "inquiries prepared in many instances, either directly or indirectly, by the chaplain" which went "'over the head' of the average young worker in both language and subject" and resulted in "a 'study-club enthusiasm,' born and expended in meetings, with no appreciable effect on the every-day problems of the young workers."[42]

The New Hampshire militants appear to have viewed the Montreal Study Week in the same light as Pope Pius XII, who had pictured it as "an event of great importance" which would enable participants "to reflect once more on the great principles which must direct their training and zeal."[43] Since the problems of the apostolate had to be envisaged from an international scale, the Holy Father had explained, it was "important that the Y.C.W. Congress and Study Week...in which so many foreign delegations are taking part, should be concerned with ensuring to the Y.C.W., in all the countries in which it is established, a unity of method and action...."[44] The Chicago leaders found it easy to follow Rome and ignore Manchester. "About all that needs to be said," Edwina Hearn wrote New York's Mary Tuohy, "is that they have been entirely inactive for approximately two years, maybe a little longer."[45] Mary Caplice had concluded much earlier that a French speaking Y.C.W. was hardly typical of the United States. Much of what the New Hampshire group said was correct, Hearn admitted, but the permanent leaders in Chicago were aware of the problems. It was their task to guide others, so that the American Y.C.W. could "begin to grow as a movement."[46]

---

[42] Ibid.

[43] Quoted from copy of Pope Pius XII's telegram to Archbishop Joseph Charbonneau of Montreal, May 24, 1947, Y.C.W. papers.

[44] Ibid.

Like all big meetings which bring adherents of a large movement together, the most important events of the international study week in Montreal, June 22-29, 1947, were not the speeches and organized discussions but the informal gatherings held on the lawns, steps, and empty classrooms of Montreal University. Edward Mitchinson, General Chaplain of the Y.C.W. in England, chaired the first part of such a meeting of American priests. Under his guiding influence, all agreed that they would place greater emphasis on establishing young men's groups in the United States. They decided to deemphasize high school boys' cells and stress "the industrial type of boy." The Americans determined that Chicago should be the center for the efforts to develop

---

[45] Hearn to Mary Tuohy, June 17, 1947, _ibid_.

[46] _Ibid_.

XUM

"a selected group of leaders" for a National Study Week of young men. They agreed that William Quinn and Roland Lavalee, O.M.I., should help the young men from Chicago prepare a basic pamphlet similar to the English Y.C.W. booklet, How to Start a Section. The priests further determined that the young men themselves should set up regional divisions as the growth of the male branch of the Y.C.W. movement made them necessary.[47]

When the question of allowing members of the girls' branch to be trained by the Grail or similar organizations came up, John Fitzsimons took over the chairmanship. Earlier, he had penned a refutation of the Catholic Worker philosophy. By virtue of his months of visitation and lecturing, he seemed best suited to pose decisively the questions for discussion. In essence, there were two points: whether priests should discourage Y.C.W. girls from going to Grailville for training, and whether to exclude from the movement girls who had been so trained. The American priests concluded that "a general system of taking people apart and training them apart is something we do not accept."[48] They affirmed collectively that "the Y.C.W., as an autonomous movement, has within itself all the means necessary to provide a complete training for its

---

[47] See mimeographed minutes of Rev. John J. Berkery, 1-2, Hillenbrand papers.

[48] Ibid., 3.

XUM

members."[49] In the absence of national regulative authority, however, they muted the application of these resolutions by placing the responsibility for accepting or rejecting a Grail-trained young lady directly upon the shoulders of the priest concerned in any particular case.[50]

In the week following the Montreal Congress, the young women took steps to insure they could exercise responsibility with some semblance of recognized authority. In their first real national study weekend, held in Syosset, Long Island, in July, the delegates formed a General Committee, headed by Edwina Hearn, whom they chose as General Chairman. They voted to establish the headquarters of the American Y.C.W. in Chicago. For the first time, then, the women's branch had an elected executive committee. Participants resolved to deal with several other critical issues. They specified first that the Young Christian Workers was "ONE movement composed of boys and girls," and then recognized officially that "the Y.C.W. girls here in the United States are a group not truly representing the mentality of the entire Nation."[51] To remedy this failing, delegates concluded that their movement must now look toward recruiting factory girls, waitresses, and those in comparable occupations. They agreed further that, because of the size of the United States, their organization needed a "physical binding" in a body representing every region, each to send two delegates to a General Council meeting twice a year in Chicago. They directed this body to write an American edition of How to Start a Section and to prepare social inquiries for the national program.[52]

---

[49] Ibid.

[50] Ibid.

[51] Report of Study Weekend, Syosset, Long Island, July 4-6, 1947, 2, Zotti papers.

Two weeks later, a group of representative students for the Midwestern Region of Y.C.S. met to formulate their common program. Their Study Week at Saint Mary's Academy, South Bend, Indiana, July 19-22, 1947 did not result in such a formal structure. The students determined to pursue as a new theme the "Integration of Studies in Life." If Y.C.S. members were to build an ideal college, delegates agreed, they must "all consciously work together on the same program of construction." When all Catholic students had worked on their program and made it a reality "in the lives of all students...in all of our schools," this first step toward unity would facilitate "the acceptance of that mental discipline which student life imposes."[53] Above all, Study Week participants agreed, they must use common means. To promote this objective, they picked Patricia Ollivier as secretary to their Midwestern Region.

---

[52] *Ibid.*, 3.

[53] *The Program for 1947-48: Integration of Studies in Life*, 1, Y.C.W. papers.

On July 24, 1947 Hillenbrand, John Egan and William Quinn met with Pat Keegan, Mary Caplice, Edwina Hearn, and the two Chicago male workers, Tony Zivalich and Ed Dansart, in the first meeting of what they styled the Y.C.W. Planning Committee. Keegan's contribution was most crucial. He recounted his visit with Msgr. Harold Carroll, the N.C.W.C. general secretary. Their discussion, he explained, had revolved around three basic points. The national secretariat recommended the movement and would give it assistance. As the Y.C.W. progressed and developed, it should get approval of bishops and "any formation of a National Committee or Council should be made through them."[54] Keegan noted that everywhere he went people introduced themselves as "Catholic Actionists," and he suggested that "we need to clarify the difference between Catholic Action movements and Y.C.W..... We want to be independent as Y.C.W., but also helpful to C.A. movements."[55] The preservation of organizational integrity required chaplains who were, in Keegan's words, "true Y.C.W." He suggested that Hillenbrand become General Chaplain for the Y.C.W., and attend all important meetings. Y.C.W. chaplains should not work with student groups but ideally should confine their efforts to one workers' group.

---

[54] *Minutes of the Y.C.W. Planning Committee, 8:00 P.M., Thursday, July 24, 1947*, 1, Y.C.W. papers.

[55] *Ibid.*, 2.

Important as was the chaplain question, there remained the organizational exigencies. The Planning Committee examined the general structure of Y.C.W. organizations in other countries in order to prepare a provisional national organization. They formulated the general structure and policy of the Publications Branch, made preparations for the first General Council meetings of the boys' and girls' branches, and touched upon a long term plan dealing with the formation of a general secretariat. In this effort Chicago was to be the center, not only because the groups there had the approval of Cardinal Stritch, but because Mary Caplice and Edwina Hearn had sufficient training. "We need to assume this responsibility immediately and be definite about it," said Keegan. However, he added, the Chicago leaders "should use the terms of 'Bureau' or 'Secretariat' and not 'National' in order not to conflict with the NCWC." To counteract the tendency to develop "central" rather than "parish" groups, the movement should develop its local units in the parish, in accordance with the plans of a diocese, so that "as [the] time is ripe with [the] Movement...the Bishop [might] be asked to appoint a Chaplain recommended by us in Chicago and that will guarantee unity." In all these undertakings, moreover, "we need to speak of the Movement as YCW and not as Catholic Action."[56]

The Chicago and South Bend leaders used the Fifth Annual Catholic Action Study Week for Priests, held at Notre Dame, August 4-8, 1947, to secure new chaplains. They could not, and did not, dispense with Catholic Action terminology, since the printed program reproduced the classic statements of Pope Pius XI and referred to the movements of workers, students, and farmers as "specialized forms of Catholic Action."[57] Moreover, this fifth such gathering had the episcopal patronage of Archbishop John J. Mitty, who had previously forbidden lay members in his diocese to attend out-of-state conferences.[58] To dissipate such advantages by a more specific organizational terminology would have been counterproductive. Nevertheless, they struck hard at the theme that their movements were now ready to effect sorely needed social reforms.

The proponents of specialized action gained an important new adherent, Monsignor Luigi Ligutti, executive secretary of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference. He explained that Australia and New Zealand, where he had visited recently, faced greater practical difficulties than any rural district in the United

---

[56] Ibid., 3.

[57] See the program for the Fifth Annual Catholic Action Study Week for Priests, Zotti papers.

[58] Ibid. See Ronz to Caplice, October 24, 1946, Y.C.W. papers.

States. His own conference had failed in its direct contact with rural American Catholics, but Rural Catholic Action has "positively succeeded" in those two nations. One possible reason, he suggested, was that "their literature is by far better than ours." Their central organization was also more effective. "For one thing," he explained, "Australian and New Zealand bishops have a unified and single understanding of the meaning of Catholic Action. This fact makes the job easier."[59] Ligutti saw one basic solution for the United States. What Catholic rural communities needed was a specialized format with leadership in the milieu, the "like to like apostolate."[60] He summoned priests who had followed his work to meet with Eugene Geissler to form the Catholic Action Committee of the National Rural Life Conference. At his own instigation, Ligutti explained, Geissler had prepared a new handbook for beginning ruralists: *Young Christian Farmers: A Program of Rural Action*. "We are now setting out to attack the problem at the roots," Ligutti concluded. "Many of us have come to the conclusion that the use of the Catholic Action cell technique is the way to approach our rural people. We must, therefore, convince our leaders of the need for the development of rural Catholic Action

---

[59] Rt. Rev. Luigi Ligutti, "The Rural Movement," in *The Lay Apostolate and the Priest*, 12.

[60] *Ibid*., 11.

XUM

and plan accordingly.... We must sell Bishops and rural priests on the idea, and then train leaders."[61]

Chicago's William Quinn explained the importance of the workers' movement by noting that "it aims not 'to occupy leisure time,' not 'to keep them off the streets' but to penetrate their normal environment.... Its constant theme is conquest--of every field of the worker's life."[62] Louis Putz argued that the formation of the National Student Association and the International Union of Students made it imperative that Catholics learn to reverse "the policy of isolation" and guarantee by their presence in such organizations that "their members be influenced by the Christian gospel."[63] He insisted that more was needed than local groups of well-trained leaders. Zealous chaplains might develop effective local impact on an environment, but all such action "would be ephemeral and piecemeal" if it didn't come to grips with "the deep problems" of the student world. He concluded, "Only a movement guided by a full-time and permanent lay-staff can assure a solid, if not necessarily a uniform formation, can view the student world as a whole...[and] can institute powerful means...such as a magazine with strong ideas."[64]

---

[61] Ibid., 11.

[62] Rev. William Quinn, "The Y.C.W.," in The Lay Apostolate and the Priest, 18.

[63] See Rev. Louis Putz, "~~Groumd~~ Ground Plan for Young Christian Students," in The Lay Apostolate and the Priest, 14.

Charles Marhoefer attempted to overcome any fears that potential chaplains might harbor. He noted that many in attendance seemed to exhibit a fear of starting because of their belief that they might fail in their first attempt. Such a feeling, he argued, was at the same time quite reasonable and quite absurd. Experience suggested that priests new in the work should expect, rather than fear, failure in their first effort. "This is particularly true," Marhoefer added, "if you are working with lay people who know nothing of the techniques."[65] Those who became discouraged when their first cell failed to function didn't realize that they merely followed the footsteps of priests who pioneered with family groups. Their agonies would disappear if they brought in lay consultants from one of the headquarters. "In Chicago," he reported, "the work continues and will continue. There are now eight groups of women and ten groups of men. We have one group struggling to take shape in a working man's parish...and they have shown how we can make a parish a center for true community spirit. The great need is the need for chaplains."[66]

Claude Julien attempted to resolve another problem

---

[64] _Ibid_., 16.

[65] Quoted in "Panel Discussion on Family Groups," _ibid_., 29-30.

[66] _Ibid_., 30.

XUM

which seemed to keep some priests from the specialized movements, that is, the lack of an episcopal mandate. He held up the example of the Mouevment populaire de familie (MPF). That organization didn't even include the work "Christian" in its title, he explained, to show that it was open even to the non-baptized. It had no mandate from the French bishops. He pointed out further that "mandate" had a precise meaning: he who received one acted not under his own responsibility but under the responsibility of the one giving it. He then argued that "the word 'mandate' is incompatible with the real responsibility of laymen in the Church," but softened the bluntness of his judgment by explaining that the Assembly of Cardinals and Archbishops in Paris had determined the previous year to keep the word because of long usage, but to define it as a "recognition" of the Catholic apostolate.[67]

All these presentations set the stage for corporate decision-making. On the last day of the Study Week, the participants resolved to come to grips with the problem and look for prospective lay leaders as soon as possible.[68] They resolved secondly to begin with young men's groups, if at all possible.[69] They urged the

---

[67] Ibid., 31.

[68] See "Resolutions," ibid., 55.

[69] Ibid.

Chicago headquarters to develop new specialized bulletins as soon as possible, and resolved that "in order that the movements may remain authentic, we judge it desirable that any Priest beginning should follow the procedure of the handbooks."[70] Since the leaders of the Y.C.S. College Movement, the Y.C.S. High School Movement, and the Y.C.W. girl's branch had prepared programs of social inquiries, they urged interested priests to obtain those booklets from the secretaries of the movements, located now at their Chicago headquarters.

The Priests' Study Week met almost exactly one year after Cardijn's first tour of the United States. During that period, leaders of specialized Catholic Action had directed their major attention toward creating a national organization. They had done so, moreover, by beginning first with the Y.C.W., which Cardijn viewed as the base point for the other specialized organizations. Only in limited terms had they succeeded. The status of the movements still remained problemmatical. Through surveys, questionnaires, and correspondence, the Y.C.W. girls had elicited a fairly accurate picture of the range and depth of organized services. They had, moreover, established an executive committee for their branch. The young men's movement remained largely a hope, even though members of the International Bureau believed that group most representative of the masses of young workers. The Young Christian Students pointed toward a world community of students, but they had not been able to organize anything but a Midwestern Region. A handbook for Young Christian Farmers was in print, but hardly one true cell existed throughout the country. Separate cells of adult men and women were merging into couple's groups, but most activity centered in Chicago and comprised less than twenty cells. Y.C.W. chaplains had settled the question of autonomous training and action programs, but their decisions remained unofficial. Adherents argued that their ideology and techniques could prove attractive to great numbers of people, but their attempts to spread the word of their mission had not changed that manifesto into cold fact. Episcopal permissions had been sought and gained, but such minor achievements promoted neither organizational solidarity or effective recognition. The question of who could or should organize the social apostolate still remained.

---

[70] _Ibid_.

XUM

CHAPTER EIGHT

AUTONOMOUS LAY MOVEMENTS, 1947-1949

In 1947 the leaders of specialized Catholic Action began to organize general committees to direct their movements. At the same time they began to confront even more directly than before the subtle interaction between theological and organizational principles so characteristic of Roman Catholicism. Since they viewed specialized action as a total apostolate, they did not wish to be defined simply as another Catholic organization. Their aim was to bring clergy and laity together as members of an organism, the Body of Christ, and to see that both worked together, each in their own field, so that the Church could go out to the world and change it. Restoration of society, however, called for either a restoration of an ancient understanding of the laymen's role or the articulation of a new one. Tutelage under European champions of the Cardijn formula did not at first sufficiently counter the institutional and terminological problems which seemed at every point to blunt lay efforts to create national movements. Gradually, however, chaplains and leaders reformulated the sanctioned names, phrases, and words which they had used earlier to impell others to action. Specialized Catholic Action gave way to autonomous movements of the lay apostolate.

In August, 1947, the General Council of the Y.C.W. girls put the cell movement to death. They did so by substituting the term "leaders' group" for what they had consistently portrayed in organic terms. Members of the General Council agreed also to follow the suggestion of Pat Keegan that their movement no longer employ the sanctioned label of "Catholic Action." In effect, they set aside the special terminology which for years had been the key source for justifying the status they attached to their federations and to their methods. Their aim was to move beyond theory to practical questions of group dynamics, community institutions, and concerted action. Officers cautioned section presidents and chaplains against "making any radical changes in basic principles" since they foresaw modifications chiefly "in regard to language, [and] specific suggestions for action."[1] Delegates to the meeting also specified that the General Council was responsible for policy formulation.[2]

Social movements which cannot control their members or whose headquarters possess no central authority are particularly prone to subtle forms of manipulation. In

---

[1] See *Report of 1st General Council Meeting, August 9th, 10th, 1947, Chicago, Illinois*, 1-2, Y.C.W. papers.

[2] *Ibid*., 5.

XUM

the case of the specialized movements of Catholic Action, the focus of all tactical changes was the issue of autonomy, especially concerning the question of priestly authority over lay movements. In the canon law of the Catholic Church, each bishop has an immediate responsibility for and jurisdiction over the faithful in his own diocese. Efforts to counteract regional variations had to take cognizance of that fact. Even though Chicago leaders had the approval of Cardinal Stritch, they had no mandate to engage in broader promotional campaigns. Because the movement's offices were located in Chicago, their leaders fell under the guidelines Stritch had formulated. Six years earlier he had stated that there must be no publicity. That prohibition still stood. It reflected the Cardinal's understanding of the value of small groups and their actions, but it also represented a constraint upon Cardijn's hopes for an influential movement capable of significant impact on public opinion and social institutions.

The freedom to disseminate information was essential. Establishing headquarters in Chicago offered the advantages of permanent workers, but it provided no immediate solution to episcopal discouragement of broad-scale public relations. Officers in Chicago had no illusions that the new system of dues inaugurated at the first Council meeting would suffice to meet the needs of salaries and clerical expenses. No general fund had

XUM

existed prior to the decision to form a national organization, and the difficulty of securing the $10,000 set as a bare minimum for the first year's expenses loomed large. The new officers had the task of building up confidence in their headquarters and winning others to the idea of recognizing their authority. Only an effective campaign to gain acceptance of their ability to handle the minute details of organizational mechanics could counter the potential opposition to their plans. Only a broadened program of publications, thought Patricia Ollivier, would enable the Young Christian Students to convince others that they had the answer men were looking for.[3] Could mass movements develop without money and publications? How were the leaders to promote the growth they deemed essential? Could they convince chaplains and lay members on the West and East Coasts to follow the directions they charted? Such were the questions which the new officers had to face.

In early September Ed Dansart, unofficial secretary to the male Y.C.W. branch began working full-time at its general headquarters. Together with Edwina Hearn, general chairman to the girl's Y.C.W., he began working on these problems. Their first step was to demand that non-parish groups be broken up. New members must know from the start that their job was to start forming a parish team. Such an approach to organizing had the advantage of replicating the structure of the Church, of exploiting neighborhood consciousness, and of extending the potential of team formation through natural groupings of friends. For various reasons few Y.C.W. sections had begun in parishes. The leaders now bent their energies to changing that situation. They did not want either the older or the beginning groups to meet outside the parish.[4] Putting an end to central sections and building up the movement in the parishes seemed one effective way to defuse any opposition from pastors and from bishops.

---

[3] See Patricia Ollivier, "What is a Movement?" Concord, I, No. 1 (October, 1947), 26,where the Midwestern Region secretary argued that "if our movement is real we will naturally diffuse our ideas in different spirits and by different means of expression. Our doctrine is not secret. It must come to life in the greatest ways of expression that we possess. We will write, we will print, we will build. We will convince!"

Edwina Hearn and Dansart next paid a joint visit to Joseph P. Kennedy in order to enlist his aid in obtaining a building for a new headquarters. The former was convinced that the Young Christian Workers were finally on the right track, and she hoped to offset the financial constraints that made their movement so fragile. Kennedy's support was limited to commending the leaders and their case to Cardinal Stritch.[5] In New

---

[4] See Minutes of Y.C.W. Planning Committee, Friday, September 5, 1947, 2; Hearn to Mary Gillig, September 10, 1947; Hearn to Eileen Labrecht, September 22, 1947; Dansart to "Dear Sir," September 2, 1947 (form letter); Dansart to Rev. Edward Sippel, November 16, 1947; and Hearn to Rev. Joseph A. Holzeimer, December 20, 1947, Y.C.W. papers.

[5] See Joseph P. Kennedy to Hearn, October 22, 1947; and Kennedy to Hearn, September 5, 1947, ibid.

XUM

York Pat Keegan met Gretta Palmer and Claire Booth Luce at a dinner meeting arranged through Cardijn's friends and supporters, but he also received no money.[6] So confident were the permanent staff that opportunities were opening up for strong, autonomous lay movements that they interpreted the verbal support they received as almost as good as material support. Kennedy's praise, Miss Hearn wrote, "was a little coup d'etat which means a great deal more than appears on the surface."[7] In this judgment she was mistaken. Personal praise from influential laymen provided no counterweight to the institutional pressures which impinged upon episcopal plans for organizing Catholic life.

With other bishops, Stritch specifically discouraged radio programs as apromotional means. When a Catholic Radio Forum in Pennsylvania requested facts about Canon Cardijn and his movements for preparation of a script, leaders of the general Y.C.W. were forced to refuse their aid. "We could supply you with facts," they responded, "but we are not free to do so at this time." Though such a program would not be inopportune, they added, a post-production follow-up explaining the methods and techniques of the Y.C.W. "would not be advisable." Zivalich spelled out the real status of their movement when he explained,

---

[6] See Keegan to Tony Zivalich and Ed Dansart, October 3, 1947, ibid.

[7] See Hearn to Kevin Muir, November 1, 1947, ibid.

"Our movement is not a secret or underground one--information is given freely to interested individuals or groups--but not to the general public." It was his wish, affirmed also by the International Bureau, that the Radio Forum not follow up their earlier biographical segment on the Belgian founder. At its present stage of growth, the Y.C.W. found it particularly advantageous "that we do not become too obvious."[8]

Leaders in the students' movement were confronted with the same problem of secrecy. They felt that the two alternatives of secrecy or publicity was a false dichotomy, but they discerned signs of a misunderstanding among educators that they felt had plagued the Y.C.S. in many colleges where a promising start had been made. Secrecy made their movement "appear subversive, rebellious, and irresponsible." It was impossible, they argued, that a "true YCS" could remain a secret society. "So we say to those groups which have been working purposely in the dark" they concluded, "come out of the shadows; be proud of YCS, its aims, and programs; answer the questions of the interested and the curious; 'let your light shine before men....'"[9]

Reflection on these matters led the Y.C.W. general officers to adopt a new approach to organizing local sections. Their hope was that groups would be started everywhere throughout the country.[10] Mary Tuohy, the new secretary treasurer, laid out the manner in which local groups could handle the problem of diocesan approbation. "While it is necessary that the bishop know that the Y.C.W. exists in his diocese," she wrote, "it is not necessary that there be any official approval or mandate." In some way the chaplain of a new group could let the chancery office know of its existence. He or the section president could figure best when to get permission from the chancery office. Her West Coast correspondent should know, Tuohy added, that this approach was followed in New York City, where it sufficed.[11] In the same month the Y.C.W. Planning Committee began preparations for joint General Council meetings, which they rescheduled and relocated. These changes soon brought to the fore the issue of priestly authority over lay organizations.

---

[8] Tony Zivalich and Edwina C. Hearn to Miss Klara Koeppel, secretary, Lebanon Catholic Radio Forum, November 11, 1947, _ibid_.

[9] "Y.C.S. - A Secret Society?" _Y.C.S. Bulletin_, I, No. 2 (November, 1947), 9.

The first serious rift between Chicago leaders and Brooklyn's unofficial coordinator, Rev. Francis B. Donnelly, arose from the decision to change the focus of the year's program of inquiries, but it touched even more directly on the question of ecclesiastical recognition. The Brooklyn chaplain questioned the decision-making process of the general headquarters. "The Y.C.W. is a lay movement," he wrote, "but it must fit into the ecclesiastical setup." While it remained in an unofficial status, priests were the necessary guides regarding procedures to gain diocesan approbation. Since he had taken the responsibility before his bishop and other area priests, he felt he must be given the right "to make basic and important decisions." Donnelly indicated that he didn't feel it was yet time "to begin any diocesan organization, informal as it might be." He particularly stressed that local Brooklyn chaplains and lay members must work out their own problems. "With all due respect to the national or even area officers," he explained, "I do not believe they can effectively intervene to solve these problems." When the time seemed ripe, he added, "the other chaplains and myself will see to it that we federate with due approval." He felt they could do fairly well with their bishop "if we proceed cautiously."[12] Caution was one thing, but displacing the authority of the lay leaders was something else again. Father John Egan and Edwina Hearn pressed the argument that the lay officers had the rightful authority to make decisions on organizational matters. Donnelly continued to maintain that no simple answer was possible and wanted to leave final settlement of the issue in abeyance.[13]

---

[10] See Hearn to Eileen Labrecht, November 21, 1947, ibid.

[11] Mary Tuohy to Miss Rita Lefevre, North Hollywood, California, December 8, 1947, ibid.

---

[12] Rev. Francis B. Donnelly to Mary Tuohy, January 10, 1948, ibid.

[13] See Hearn to Beacy Molyneux, London, February 16, 1948; and Donnelly to Hearn, March 4, 1948, ibid.

XUM

Insistence on the authority of national officers was not solely a Y.C.W. concern. All movements which adopted the inquiry technique were following similar paths to national status. In their meeting at Techny, Illinois, from December 31, 1947 to January 4, 1948, over sixty student leaders determined that the responsibility for Y.C.S. was theirs. At that time they formulated statutes, created a General Council, and delegated administrative responsibilities to a General Committee. The Council was to meet at least once annually as the body "responsible for making decisions relative to the general progress of the movement." Between Council meetings the fourteen member Y.C.S. General Committee was to meet monthly to direct the movement. Its concrete tasks included taking the lead in the promotion of the current program and in the planning of future programs, taking care of dues and expenses, visiting existing groups, and assisting students who wanted to start Y.C.S. in their colleges. The bulletin which reported these organizational steps explained that a developing world community that sought expression "must not be born without the full and proper participation of students." The Committee was required by the new statutes to "represent YCS in contacts outside" and to "accept membership of new sections."[14]

---

[14] See *Y.C.S. Report on Christmas Meeting, December 31-January 4, Techny, Illinois*, Y.C.S. Papers, 6-7.

XUM

A process of organizational consolidation was under way, and leaders were not willing to make practical gains at the expense of the authority of the new general offices. For months Edwina Hearn and Mary Tuohy had hoped to gain affiliation to the general movement of San Francisco's large federation. When the West Coast leaders wrote to explain that they were not yet ready to affiliate, the Chicago headquarters responded that they would not expect them at the next Council meeting. If representatives from San Francisco decided to attend, their status "would have to be that of observer" and the meeting should exclude them "since it is composed of Council members who are an official policy-making body."[15]

At the Council meeting itself, held in Scranton, Pennsylvania from April 2-4, 1948, the Y.C.W. girls imposed new conditions upon those wishing to attend their next study week. Any federation officer or section president who could not attend might suggest someone to take her place. However, such a substitute must "have full authority to represent her group and to vote on any and all matters presented." Only section presidents, federation officers, area representatives, and general council officers were allowed to attend. The Planning Committee was to review any exceptions which the Area

---

[15] Y.C.W. Girls' General Headquarters to Eileen Labrecht, San Francisco, and Josephine La Torre, Oakland, February 20, 1948, Y.C.W. Papers.

Representative might present.[16] Participants touched directly on the function of the General Council and determined that it was responsible for interpreting policy set by the International Y.C.W. and, consistent with it, of formulating new policy. They named new area representatives and decided that non-affiliated groups would no longer receive the _Leaders' Bulletin_. Council members also provided for its reorganization. They agreed that "when the Y.C.W. in the United States becomes [an] official national movement, fully recognized and approved by the bishops, the Council will become the federation heads of each diocese, section presidents in dioceses where no federation exists."[17]

At the same time the boys' branch held its first General Council meeting. Their leaders went over the rules of affiliation for new members and sections. They determined that presidents of local federations would be responsible to submit articles for their new _Leaders' Bulletin_ when the General Committee called upon them to do so. If a diocese held only one section, it was to be considered a federation until such time as more sections were started. "It will be the duty of the General Committee to affiliate the first two sections," their bulletin reported, "and from then on the duty of one of the federation officers to affiliate the other new sections to itself."[18] In their own planning sessions, priests resolved to exclude from their next study week all who were not Y.C.W. chaplains. Separate sessions would be held to indoctrinate priests just beginning or interested in beginning Y.C.W. sections. They also suggested that both branches of the movement have the same general theme in their inquiry programs, as was done in other countries.[19] Available evidence suggests that Hillenbrand and the key lay leaders anticipated future recognition by the bishops and were setting the pattern for future inter-diocesan collaboration. The report on the girls' meeting explicitly noted that "in all cases the word 'general' substitutes for the word 'national.'"[20]

---

[16] _Report of Y.C.W. Girls' Council Meeting, Scranton, Pa., April 2, 3, 4, 1948_, 2, _ibid_.

[17] _Ibid_., 4.

The first challenge to national authority came from the French-speaking J.O.C. in New Hampshire, whose leaders refused to subscribe to either the plans or the

---

[18] "Council Meeting," Leaders' Bulletin, I, No. 3 (May, 1948), 2.

[19] See Minutes of Planning Committee Meeting, May 6, 1948, 1, Y.C.W. papers.

[20] Report of Girls' Council Meeting, [11, 12, 14, 15, 16], ibid. Listing this explanatory rubric on all pages explaining the function of councils, both general and local, suggests the importance which the "general" officers attached to Keegan's suggestion of the previous July. See supra, 285, and Tuohy to Rita Lefevre, December 8, 1947, ibid., where she explained: "We do not call the headquarters 'National Headquarters' since we are not officially a national movement but 'General Headquarters.' You may be familiar with this already."

XUM

authority of the Chicago headquarters. Several weeks after the Council meetings, Baroness Bosch van Drakestein of England's Grail movement wrote the general office concerning the request of Paul Demers to reproduce the Grail publication, This Is Freedom. Hearn replied in stern tones that the Manchester group were "a completely independent bunch."' Though the organizations were not unfriendly and occasionally corresponded, she explained, the New Hampshire members did not "recognize this office nor any other group as the genuine Y.C.W." and were "the only Y.C.W. group in the country not affiliated with this office." In the past year, Hearn added, it had been well established that "we are the central office and as such have the sole right to publish and to distribute any and all Y.C.W. publications...." Only the Manchester movement had not agreed to refrain from publishing anything on their own. "We would appreciate it very much," she concluded, "if you would make it clear to them that you cannot deal with them as Y.C.W....at least as far as the U.S. is concerned...."[21]

This first challenge paled into insignificance compared to that presented by Joseph E. Schieder, new director of the N.C.W.C. Youth Department. His predecessor, Charles Bermingham, had seemed an ally, but Schieder's plans and proposals demonstrated clearly that the episcopal plan to coordinate all youth activities was still very much alive. In early May Schieder visited the Chicago headquarters and indicated to Ed Dansart, Edwina Hearn, Mary Tuohy, and Monsignor Hillenbrand that he would do all in his power to aid the movement achieve semi-official recognition. In return, the Y.C.W. should affiliate with the National Catholic Youth Council. When people asked him about the Young Christian Workers, Schieder explained, he could then freely say that it was officially recognized. Although Hillenbrand and the lay leaders had long planned for and desired some form of official recognition, they refused his offer. Hillenbrand notified the Planning Committee that Rev. Philip J. Kenney, their friend at the national conference, had warned against such affiliation as one that would not benefit the movement.[22] Edwina Hearn related to the International Bureau the offer and its rejection. "We refused this offer because it would be detrimental to the YCW to be so affiliated," she explained. "Under the Youth Department the YCW would become just another one of the youth organizations and we would not be free to make our own policies or decisions--we would have to do just what we are told--and that Department doesn't understand what the Y.C.W. is trying to do...."[23]

---

[21] Hearn to Baroness Bosch van Drakestein, April 27, 1948, Y.C.W. papers.

---

[22] See Minutes of Planning Committee Meeting, May 6, 1948, 4; and Tony Zivalich to Keegan, May 7, 1948, ibid.

[23] Hearn to Marguerite Fievez, May 20, 1948, ibid.

To Schieder, the leaders could mask their long-range concerns by simply observing that their movement was not yet in a position to seek national prominence through recognition by the N.C.W.C.[24] Among themselves, they agreed that beyond all questions of practical advantage stood the requirement of fidelity to a vision. Their system of values had long emphasized that social problems would find their natural solution not in common organizations but in regenerative movements. The priests with whom they worked were sharply critical of ecclesiastical projects which emphasized the importance of living a Christian life, but did so by focusing attention almost exclusively on personal piety and acting as though there were no challenge to Christianity in the oppression and grinding down of workers. They believed also that the apostolate of young workers should shape the direction of the groups of students and adults that were now beginning to undertake new services and projects. The whole social order remained the object of their attention since they conceived of specialized action as a total apostolate.[25]

These same views seemed to be taking root in the adult groups that were beginning to organize. In May,

---

[24] See Zivalich to Keegan, May 7, 1948, ibid.

[25] See Daniel M. Cantwell, "The Church and Social Institutions," Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin, VII (November, 1948), 59-64, for a forceful expression of these views.

XUM

1948 the leaders of the mens' Catholic Action cells in Chicago published their first issue of Act since the previous December. Its major argument was that adult groups were on the march. Chicago was not alone in its attempts to foster Catholic Action. Reports from nine centers of activity pointed toward an expansion of influence. From South Bend, Burnie Bauer reported on its family groups. Michael Putnam reported that both adult and student groups were flourishing in Minnesota. In Cleveland, specialized Catholic Action operated under the name of the Lay Legion, but its actions had been made difficult because the Legion did not function under a mandate from the bishop and thus could not cross parish lines.[26] In New York plans had recently been made to base the adult movement on experimental leaders' groups of married couples. From the very beginning leaders had tried to model it on the movement of the workers, and its chaplain, Declan Bailey, D.F.M., called for "cooperation on a local, regional, and national plane." He argued that there "must not be a New York movement, or a Chicago movement." As the Young Christian Workers was the natural solution to the existing problems of youth, he argued, so must the married movement be the natural solution to the problems of home and family life.[27]

---

[26] See "How CA Operates in Cleveland," Act, II, No. 1 (May, 1948), 1.

[27] "New York Experiment Build Around C.A. Groups," ibid., 4.

The editor summarized these reports by suggesting that all members should deepen their dedication to their movement by reflecting that it was an opportunity "for working out our own total, not partial destiny, and for helping others to do so."[28]

In a series of summer study weeks and conferences running from June to September, Catholic Action leaders spelled out their conviction that specialized movements could not be taken lightly as mere adjuncts to traditional organizations. Their central argument was that lay social responsibilities must be exercised in a frontal assault on the capitalistic ethos of modern American life. Only group action embued with the spirit of charity, they concluded, could build a new community life. Their contribution to Christ's design and work, the argument ran, allowed social responsibility to be exercised in a natural way. Such assertions rested on premises, assumptions, and arguments they had formulated over the previous decade.

In their Cleveland Study Week, June 12-17, 1948, the Y.C.S. leaders called upon collegians to recognize the realities of social life and to take broader action to change its future evolution. Their Program Kit suggested as initial areas of inquiry discrimination, labor, and federal aid to education. It also recommended

---

[28] "Editorials," ibid., 2.

XUM

seminars on the relationship of intellectuals and workers, field trips to local labor unions, and organized aid for strikers. Students were to familiarize themselves with the Taft-Hartley law, to investigate the F.E.C.P. and Civil Rights bills, and to examine the potential candidates in the November elections and participate in political rallies.[29] The General Committee expected their program on social responsibility to develop a new student maturity in the political and economic phases of their lives. It aimed its recommendations toward political action in order to foster in the Young Christian Students a new realization of the actual dependence of the student community on the welfare of society. The actions which Y.C.S. members undertook were to be based on a sense of service to the common good of all society as well as of the student community.

In the first week of August, the American Y.C.S. played host to the first International Y.C.S. Study Week in the Western Hemisphere. Charles J. Marhoefer, chaplain to the Midwestern Region of the Y.C.S. took this occasion to argue that the students' movement was not a youth organization. He thought that even some Y.C.S. leaders did not define themselves as adults. Their questionnaire, for instance, asked, "Are the services in your school conducted by students or by adults?" He argued that a student was an adult when he entered college. Such a view, Marhoefer explained, was directly connected with their new program. "Let me carry the thought a step forward," he continued. "We have said that a student is an adult. He has a job of service to the community in the total society." Unless chaplains possessed the concept of the adult student, they might be misled into thinking that carrying the program into national politics went beyond the students' field. Marhoefer insisted that priests work to make collegians social and serviceable, so that they could fulfill their responsibility of producing "serviceable truth." Students would offer this truth to society, whose members could then freely choose to accept or reject it. Collegians had a definite role to play in the formulation of value judgments regarding political matters. It was the chaplains' task, then, "to aim at groups of students and faculties who, while they are studying and living as students, begin at once to offer their services to the whole society by finding by whatever means possible [a way] to spread abroad ideas that should be growing on their campuses."[30]

---

[29] See Students' Social Responsibility Program Kit, 9, 10, 14, Y.C.S. papers.

In the same month, other leaders began to call for

---

[30] See Charles J. Marhoefer, "An Approach to the College--Y.C.S.," Address at Priests' Study Week, Rosary College, River Forest, Illinois, August, 1948, as reproduced in Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin, VII (December, 1948), 73-78.

XUM

a broader approach to adult social action. Hillenbrand made his position clear in a conference of Cana Conference leaders sponsored by John Egan. He argued that Catholic Action groups were needed in every parish. Burnie Bauer, business manager for Fides Publishers, argued that the family retreat movement was an inadequate response to the crisis facing family life in modern America. He explained that Cana Conferences possessed definite limitations and suggested that leaders "must go beyond them" by a program of "organized action." Those interested in the re-Christianizing of family life must grapple with the problem of "just what program can accomplish the result?" His own experience in South Bend, Bauer added, convinced him that "the Christian Family movement is the one which today can realize the goal of the Cana Conference movement." Retreats were useful, Bauer admitted, but were "only a tool towards the establishing of a Christian society in a community." They started no new services and set up no new institutions. The restoration of Christian values in community life, he concluded, would begin only when Cana leaders went further than before by promoting Christian services, practices, and customs.[31]

Over the Labor Day weekend the Y.C.W. boys gathered in Brooklyn, New York, for their second annual Study Week. On this occasion Hillenbrand explained the significance of America's social situation. Workers could not rest content with kind employers, he argued, but must seek power and new forms of equality. Power rested in the hands of management, he suggested, while tremendous wealth was in the hands of a few individuals at the upper level of American society. Workers could find no salvation except through the movement of Young Christian Workers. At one time the Church had an impact on social life, he continued, but it no longer exerted much influence. "Why do we live in an age where seemingly the Church has so little effect?" he asked. Hillenbrand then answered that something had happened "inside the church" which prevented it from functioning as a "whole Church." In some fashion the Catholic laity had been shunted aside. "To have this terrific impact," he insisted, "we must restore lay people." Mission efforts were important, but the Church at home had to do its job. It seemed an inescapable fact that "the only ones who are doing it are the specialized movements of Catholic Action." Workers must vindicate their freedom and dignity through the Y.C.W. The Church would begin changing the serious economic dislocations "when the Y.C.W. begins to operate."[32]

---

[31] See Burnie Bauer, "C-A, Cana & South Bend," Forum, IV (November, 1948), 7-11, 19-20. See also Hearn to Grace McCarthy, August 3, 1948, Y.C.W. papers, for a description of the family movement in Chicago and a criticism of its weaknesses.

---

[32] See Report on Young Christian Workers' Study Week, Brooklyn, New York, September 4-5, 1948, 5-6, Y.C.W. papers.

In their efforts to spell out their sense of the laymen's mission, the experienced chaplains and lay officers sometimes used the Catholic Action terminology which they had so long applied directly to their own movements. At other times they referred simply to generic notions of the lay apostolate. Their primary concern was to outline new dimensions of organized action and to bring local sections under the aegis of the programs which the general committees were formulating. A year's work on establishing the directive authority of the general councils seemed to have laid the basis for the extended influence they desired.

In late September, however, Pope Pius XII issued a new statement on Catholic Action. His Apostolic Constitution on the Sodalities of Our Lady recognized them as definitely fulfilling "every characteristic and requirement of Catholic Action." Their structure and distinctive characteristics, the Pontiff explained, were not an obstacle "to their being so designated." He noted that the Apostolic See had declared many times that Catholic Action was "not confined to a closed circle" or hedged in by "a set of rigid boundaries that must not be transgressed." He commended all who possessed "excellent zeal for the apostolate" but warned that those who desired to reduce what was done in the interests of souls "to a single pattern" made an error that was "completely alien to the mind of the Church." Catholic Action was not to

XUM

be understood as pursuing its object "according to a special method and system." The Church favored instead "a multiform unity in carrying out such [apostolic] works, by means of a brotherly cooperation, under the guidance of the Bishops, and with their efforts united and directed to one end."[33] The papal statement shattered the explanatory synthesis which Hillenbrand had earlier elaborated in his bulletin, and, in part, contributed to a reappraisal of earlier organizing efforts.

In the late fall Pat Keegan returned to the United States in the company of Father Eugene Hopkins, an English Y.C.W. chaplain. Their plan was to work with the General Committees of the movements and to travel across the country visiting Y.C.W. sections and talking to priests. They also spent a considerable amount of time in planning sessions with Hillenbrand and the general officers. Their consultations ranged over a broad spectrum of facts and issues. Keegan reaffirmed suggestions he had made in 1947 and made several new recommendations. In those meetings were charted significant new directions for the three lay movements.

Keegan suggested that Y.C.W. organizers must convince rather than overpower priests. He explained that the Young Christian Workers were part of the greater mission of the Church, but that the movement might be attacked. The leaders should aim for both tact and autonomy. If the movement were criticized, they should defend it without creating antagonisms. He recounted his visit to the Central Catholic Action Office in Rome. There he discovered that Italian, Spanish, and Argentinian churchmen objected to what they claimed was "class consciousness" in the Young Christian Workers. The Pope's personal secretary, Father Lerber, was a great friend of the movement; but Msgr. Montini was not convinced of its value, while Cardinal Pizzardo detested it. He had met Father Schieder in London and had steered him away from Cardijn. The Youth Department director, Keegan explained, admitted that he knew nothing about the Y.C.W. He felt irritated at his reception in Chicago, since he felt the officers there acted as if they were being persecuted. In response, Keegan reported, he had told Schieder that the Y.C.W. would be killed under a big umbrella and must have their own national chaplains. He suggested that the Y.C.W. leaders send reports of their activities to Father Philip Kenney and write to Schieder offering to help him.[34]

---

[33] Quoted phrases taken from the Apostolic Constitution *Bis saeculari*, September 27, 1948, as translated and abridged in Benedictine Monks of Solesmes, *The Lay Apostolate: Papal Teachings* (Boston, 1961), 486-493; and in "Excerpts from the Apostolic Constitution on the Sodality of Our Lady, Sept. 27, 1948," in *Catholic Action Notes*, II, No. 2 (1949), 1.

Keegan explained that the Y.C.W. must grow in numbers if it were to affect public opinion and institutions.[35] He suggested that the national team pick a precise leader and chaplain for each area of the country, but that they designate the latter as "key priests" rather than official chaplains since it might be difficult to get rid of them if they didn't work out well.[36]

---

[34] See Pencil notes, Reynold Hillenbrand, November 10, 1948, Hillenbrand papers.

In a five-day stopover in Chicago, Canon Cardijn ventured several suggestions of his own. He explained that the United States was a big country which would soon have big problems. The Young Christian Workers could reveal those problems. He added that it should be no part of the National Catholic Welfare Conference. The leaders, however, should project themselves as friendly and not against the national secretariat. They could explain that they were too little for the N.C.W.C. Their slogan, Hillenbrand noted, should be: "We are free -- & must remain free."[37] Cardijn insisted that the Americans must have a team of laymen who could form other leaders to a total conception of the movement. Similarly, they must have a team of priests who met regularly, were able to speak of all sides of the movement, and could thus help "build a total movement."[38]

Detailed analyses of values and of organizational priorities pushed the planning meetings to a reconsideration of two fundamental problems: Joseph Schieder and Catholic Action terminology. In early December Keegan explained that he planned to stay in the country through January. He repeated his view that the Youth Department director had not been happy about his Chicago visit. Schieder was going to insist that Y.C.W. work was not properly oriented unless it was tied up with the episcopal plan. Total submission to the Church was important not only for basically Catholic reasons but for the freedom it guaranteed. Although there was a national coordinating body in England, Keegan explained, "no bishop in England ever told us what to do." If they were told to "lie down," they would do so, but would simultaneously defend the nature and autonomy of the movement. Since the lay movements were building for the future, their leaders must "find the points of contact" with bishops and priests "instead of saying, 'oh to hell with it.'"[39]

---

[35] Ibid.

[36] See Pencil notes, Reynold Hillenbrand, November 15, 1948, ibid.

[37] Pencil notes, Hillenbrand, [between November 17 and November 21, 1948], ibid.

[38] Ibid. (Hillenbrand's underlining).

Hillenbrand had already been searching for an answer to the persistent problem of unsympathetic reactions from chancery offices. A close scrutiny of the Minutes of the N.C.W.C. Administrative Board meeting of November 12, 1940 convinced him that "the only important point" in the recommendations of the Episcopal Committee

---

[39] Pencil notes, Hillenbrand, December 2, 1948, ibid.

XUM

on Youth was the seventh provision. He carefully noted that the committee report explicitly stated that "we recommend that national and sectional youth conferences, organizations, and associations find their place in the framework of the National Catholic Youth Council." That body had been agreed upon a long time ago, but "nothing seems to have been done." It was quite likely, Hillenbrand noted, that "Fr. Schieder is probably trying to force some action on them."[40] There could be little doubt that Schieder's efforts to promote the N.C.W.C. went beyond the letter of the committee report. Keegan and Hillenbrand later agreed that they should work for his removal. Their hope was to arrange to have a priest trained and obtain for him Schieder's office "so that Y.C.W. thought will be there."[41] With Cardinal Spellman they would emphasize their points of contact, not disagreement; and they planned to make Archbishop Cushing see the problems of young workers.[42]

Strategic relations with the Youth Department, however, did not provide a solution which fully encompassed the distinctive mission which Hillenbrand and

---

[40] Pencil notes, Hillenbrand, undated, ibid. (Hillenbrand's underlining). For the exact wording of the seventh recommendation, see Paul Tanner, "The History of the Catholic Youth Council," 30.

[41] Pencil notes, Hillenbrand, undated [West Coast trip, January, 1949], Hillenbrand papers.

[42] Ibid.

Keegan assigned to lay apostles. For one thing, the immediate focus of Schieder's offer of semi-official recognition had been the Young Christian Workers. Although Cardijn, Hillenbrand, and Keegan viewed this branch of "specialized Catholic Action" as the base point for social reconstruction, there remained the question of the Young Christian students and the family movements. Chaplains had concentrated on strengthening the general movements of students and workers, but Hillenbrand was already discussing preliminary plans for a national gathering of couples at work in the family apostolate.[43] The emphasis of the adult groups on family life was to be an initial and not an exclusive concern, but their present organization brought them into a structural relationship not with the Youth Department but with Edgar Schmiedeler's Family Life Bureau. Whatever organizational mechanics favored the autonomous development of the Young Christian Workers applied equally to the adult groups. Cardijn's perspective recognized distinct social groupings but extended the same inquiry method to each. Similarly, Hillenbarnd believed that differences in chronological age or in marital status should not mar the unity of lay approaches to social problems and to organizing principles.

In two crucial meetings in mid-December, Keegan supplied the semantic mechanism for preserving the autonomy of the lay movements, especially regarding policy formulation. He argued that the workers' movement was based on facts, not on "Catholic Action." The chief obstacle to its acceptance was that priests were "mixed up about C.A. and Y.C.W."[44] He related his impressions of a meeting where Cardinal Griffin had asked, "Where is Catholic Action?" Professors who attempted to answer the prelate's question ended up contradicting each other. Their confusion explained the consensus that seemed to be growing in favor, namely, that "if things want to be C.A., they should be allowed to be."[45] Even the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine was Catholic Action.[46] At a planning session the following day, Keegan suggested that organizers for the specialized movements should present

---

[43] Pencil notes, Hillenbrand, November, 1948, ibid., where he stated that "Crowleys know all the groups" and noted "Convention, July 16 - 3rd week-end."

---

[44] Pencil notes, Hillenbrand, December 15, 1948, *ibid*.

[45] *Ibid*.

[46] *Ibid*. In the November issue of *The American Ecclesiastical Review*, Edwin V. O'Hara, bishop of Kansas City, Missouri, argued that "Catholic Action" was not limited to the "so-called specialized fields" but was "as diversified as the hierarchical apostolate." He explained the fashion in which he had set up "Catholic Action" in his own diocese through the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine. O'Hara then wrote to Rome for confirmation of the wisdom and legitimacy of his own interpretation of the papal desires. Though no formal reply came from Rome until January 9, 1949, Hillenbrand's notes suggest that both he and Keegan knew by mid-December that the Confraternity would be accepted as "a magnificant program of Catholic Action," whose lay members should be, as Joseph Cardinal Pizzardo urged in his letter to O'Hara, "spurred on...by the knowledge that, through this glorious apostolate, they are part of the magnificent army of Catholic Action." See "The Confraternity and Catholic Action," *Catholic Action Notes*, II, No. 2 (1949), 8; and "Publications," *ibid*., 7.

"the side which appeals" and should not attempt to build on the supposed defects of other organizations. With Cardinal Stritch and other bishops, they should present something that established a contact in order to bring as many as possible to feel they were sharing the inner life of the movement, "yet not affecting policy." In any difficulty with bishops, leaders should talk about their work and their parishes, and assume that churchmen would approve of experiments initiated with the awareness and permission of pastors. It was always "better to have something for bishop[s] to approve."[47] Keegan argued that they were "building something permanent in the Church" and stressed the need for a core of priests to help replenish the movement. Any priests who visited the Chicago headquarters, he insisted, should be made to "feel on the inside." He turned them to a major recommendation, suggesting that "the word 'mandate' should be deleted from our terminology."[48] This change meant removing a term that magisterial pronouncements held essential in the definition of "Catholic Action," but it promised to provide greater room for adaptations and for clear lay direction of organized action.

For ten years Hillenbrand and his associates had used papal pronouncements and terminology as one key element in their defense of specialized lay action. By December 16, 1948 he clearly sympathized with Keegan's suggestion that a "mandate" no longer be the object of their activity nor an irreplaceable check on the autonomy of the lay movements. Two days later the Adult Federation of Catholic Action in Chicago became the Federation of Christian Family Action, and the terms "cell" and "team" gave way to "section" and "action group."[49] The groups held a social gathering at Chicago's St. Clement's School to introduce their new officers and to give Keegan an opportunity to stress the urgency and need for militant Christian families working by an organized plan to return the world to Christ. The leaders innovated a new structure of officers to mark officially the trend of converting Chicago's men's and women's sections to married couple's sections.[50] This change from the sexual differentiation characteristic of Italian Catholic Action and from the framework of the Department of Lay Organization's separate Councils of Men and Women supplemented the changes in name and terminology. Probably only a minority of the 250 lay people and 20 priests who attended the Keegan rally realized the underlying reasons for the changes. The published explanation

---

[47] Pencil notes, Hillenbrand, December 16, 1948, Hillenbrand papers.

[48] Ibid.

---

[49] See "CA Is Now CFA! Chicago Changes Name and Terms," Act, III (February 15, 1949), 1, 4.

[50] See "Chicago Officers Are Introduced at Keegan Rally," ibid., 1.

XUM

suggested that "the switch from CA to CFA resulted from dissatisfaction [sic] with the generality of the term Catholic Action, and the desire to identify the movement more closely with the family." It explained also that "the broader appeal of the word Christian rather than Catholic was considered more desirable in a Catholic endeavor which expects to leaven the whole mass of American family life."[51]

On January 22, 1949, a series of three meetings was held in Chicago to plan for the first national convention of Christian Family Action. The delegates constituted an interim planning committee, and directed it to distribute to all family life units in the United States a questionnaire which could give a cross-section picture of the status and methods of the family apostolate. Several weeks later, Patrick Crowley observed that those who had worked with the movement recognized that a new unity was emerging. "Some believe that we are on the verge of real development," he explained. "We know that a national meeting is to be a reality this summer." CFA members were "just finding out that we have a great place in Christ's Church. We are no longer the unimportant members we may have thought we were." For over six months more than twenty leaders' groups had worked on the same set of inquiries. More than five hundred persons were participating in CFA in Chicago and its suburbs.

---

[51] "CA Is Now CFA," 1.

Their great destiny, Crowley concluded, was to "serve, educate and represent the family for Christ."[52] In May the lead article for Act reported that delegates from more than a dozen cities would participate in the June conference. It explained that they would exchange ideas and experiences, and then compare methods and plans. From such collaboration, it projected, "greater unity will be realized, and more effective organization and techniques will be achieved, both nationally and in the various communities."[53]

Meanwhile, the episcopal pattern for the organization of the Catholic laity remained largely the same. Under the sponsorship of Robert E. Lucey, episcopal chairman of the Department of Lay Organizations, the N.C.W.C. scheduled a workshop from April 19-22, 1949, for priest moderators of Diocesan Councils of Catholic Men and Women or other diocesan-wide lay organizations. In a letter to the archbishops and bishops of the country, Lucey reflected the episcopal statement of November, 1936, as he invited them to send participants. The priests' workshop, he noted, would be a training course for moderators of lay organizations or priests "who may be assigned by their Bishops to get federations or councils...organized throughout the diocese in a strong, unified Catholic

---

[52] "From the President's Desk," Act, III (February 15, 1949), 2. See also "National Meet at Chicago in June," ibid., 3.

[53] "Groups Meet in Chicago June 17-19," ibid., III (May 15, 1949), 1.

Action program."[54] In Havana, Cuba, Cardinal Spellman headed a delegation to the second Interamerican Catholic Action Week, February 6-13, 1949. One of the four main points of discussion was "the need to diffuse Christian social principles by means of Catholic Action."[55]

Although the episcopal language and program continued to reflect their orientation during the late 1930's, the same was not true of the specialized movements. All three movements had changed, and they had done so consciously. Their efforts to organize national councils required some way to overcome the problem of episcopal mandates. Their solution was to set aside the sanctioned terminology of Vatican pronouncements. In taking this step they relied on their knowledge of increasingly flexible definitions by Pope Pius XII. That flexibility enabled them to structure national movements, maintain their autonomy, and refine their operational procedures.

When the Young Christian Students met in Davenport, Iowa, June 11-16, 1949, they noted explicitly a shift in the emphasis of their study session. Those who formulated the new year's program reaffirmed that "YCS is an ordered movement--a way of life, not an organization." They explained that "in order that a movement be unified in its growth," it was necessary that "its structure be understood by all members." The General Committee decided that Concord, started two years earlier as a YCS service, would no longer bear a YCS label but instead "should ever reach outward, especially to secular schools." It was not to be limited to YCS minded people, though its editors would attempt to keep the magazine "faithful to the mystique or the spirit of YCS." Apparently, some of the students were concerned with the heavy emphasis on outreach. The editors commented on some of the questions raised at Davenport, such as "Isn't YCS the service of Christ, not the world? Isn't it "Catholic Action?" The leaders admitted that such questions were important, especially since it was "a terrible desperation for one to doubt that he is fulfilling his purpose." They answered that

---

[54] See "Workshop for Priests," Catholic Action Notes, II, No. 2 (1949), 8, which excerpts passages of Lucey's letter to the Archbishops and Bishops.

[55] See "Havana Week," ibid.

> whether YCS is Catholic Action in the strict sense or not is disputed in several quarters. YCS has a specific purpose and special characteristics. If that is Catholic Action, fine. We think it is, but we cannot afford to be concerned that we bear the title. There is a job crying for us to do; the schools illustrate the fact.

They touched upon the key point when they concluded: "Whether we have a Catholic-Action label or not, YCS will continue its work, God willing."[56]

When the first national convention of Christian Family Action met at Childerly Retreat House, Wheeling, Illinois, June 17-19, 1949, participating couples also showed a disregard for the official label. The fifty-nine delegates represented eleven different cities, and they voted to create a national "coordinating committee." This final step in organizing, Act recounted, was done with "enthusiastic unanimity." Most of the cities reported following the Chicago example of a federation of couple's sections, each with a chaplain and an action group. Delegates discovered that eight of the federations employed the name "Christian Family Movement" and that Cincinnati was the only location "where 'Catholic Action' was still used."[57] Joint discussion sessions revealed that most of the delegations strongly relied on the social inquiry, with its observe, judge, act procedure, for studying and influencing the environment. What was most important, therefore, was not the label of "Catholic Action" but a proven technique for operating the family apostolate.[58]

---

[56] See Realization of Student Life, Report of 1949 Study Week Held at Davenport, Iowa, 4, 10-11, 30, Y.C.S. papers.

The girls' branch of the Y.C.W. had agreed almost two years earlier to refer to their movement by its specific name rather than by the Catholic Action label. In the November, 1949 issue of the Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin, William Quinn injected an editorial comment which provided an analytic explanation of these developments. The anonymous author pointed to three specific documents, namely, Pope Pius XII's Apostolic

---

[57] "Delegates Probe Problems, Methods," Act, III (August, 15, 1949), 2.

[58] Ibid. See also "CFA Moves Toward National Unity," ibid., 1, 4.

Constitution of September 27, 1948, Pizzardo's January 9 letter to Bishop O'Hara, and the Holy Father's March 21, 1949 letter to Canon Cardijn. He asked, "What should be our reaction to these three pronouncements?" The answer revealed the degree of the changes which had slowly taken place. "If the seminarian's approach to Catholic Action is exclusively by way of papal pronouncements," the article explained, "he has to make a choice between three approved forms of Catholic Action." Armchair theologians would have much to ponder, for they must face "the juridical aspects of multiform Catholic Action," which would necessarily "pose the problem of mandates." To the YCW chaplain, the argument ran, these pronouncements posed no problem. He could rest content that the Pope continued to bless Cardijn's work and need "not concern himself any longer with the theory of Catholic Action." He left "the problem of mandates" to the Ordinaries and occupied his mind with the attempt to reconcile the contradiction between the religion young workers professed and the social conditions in which they worked. "He desires much that the Pope bless his work," concluded the analysis, "but he does not want an exclusive blessing."[59]

In a signed letter, also in the November issue, Gerald Weber, CFM chaplain, explained that the first thing those working in the movement should learn was that

---

[59] "Recent Papal Pronouncements," Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin, VIII (November, 1949), 62-63.

"the things in the blueprints do not always work out." He called attention to the CFM booklet, For Happier Families, which had been distributed to about 100 cities, including Paris and other places abroad. He complained particularly about a recent article which suggested that the CFM didn't exist to any great extent in the United States and would never develop until enough young people from YCS and YCW groups married. Every word in the CFM publication had come from experience, Weber argued. "We have done all the things listed and have not included one thing that was not done. Quite an achievement for an organization that does not seem to exist." He admitted that married groups in the cities participating in the Childerly convention did not all work in exactly the same way, but argued that the discussion sessions "helped clear the air" so that "the Christian Family Movement is stirring and growing."[60]

In this case, contrary to earlier extravagant claims, the analysis was accurate. After years of effort, all three specialized movements had established unofficial national committees, formulated specific organizational structures, and defined more exactly their identity and mission. Ideology, leadership, and organization had coalesced, however, to give birth not to specialized movements of "Catholic Action" but of the lay apostolate. The lay sense of an autonomous mission had overflowed the

---

[60] Gerald Weber, "To the Editor," ibid., 63-64.

XUM

boundary of restrictive terminology and partially countered the institutional confines in which the episcopal program seemed destined to encircle it. Leaders had laid an institutional base which could, and in fact did, lead to a rapid "extension and development" during the decade of the 1950's. This achievement did not mean the elimination of the debate between Reynold Hillenbrand and N.C.W.C. staff personnel over autonomy and affiliation. Those disagreements, though rooted in the earlier competition of plans and principles, are sufficiently different in content and intensity to warrant a sequel to this study.

XUM

CONCLUSION

The definition which Pope Pius XI attached to Catholic Action explained it as "the participation of the laity in the apostolate of the Church's hierarchy." He and his successor, Pope Pius XII, wrote often of the dignity and importance of the lay apostolate. They made it clear that the Holy See would recognize no lay organization which was not completely submissive to the bishops or which strayed beyond the limits of orthodoxy. The former directed laity to Catholic Action as their primary work. In his encyclicals he laid down as its chief aim the solution of social problems in the light of Christian principles. He called the laity to the exercise of their "royal priesthood" and defended Catholic Action against the onset of Fascism by presenting it as an integral part of the pastoral ministry. The latter made its organization more flexible by asking for it to be introduced into all parishes, while at the same time extending it to the international level. Pius XII also defined more clearly its relationship with other movements. Both insisted that its structure must include distinct organizations for various categories of the faithful, based primarily on differentiations of age and sex, and secondarily, on occupations, in

XUM

order to make possible the apostolate of like by like.

In European countries, the national hierarchies in the 1920's and 1930's incorporated specialized occupational movements into their national coordinating agencies. In the United States, the bishops reacted differently. In their statements of 1935 and 1936, they distinguished between Catholic Action and Catholic Activity, and directed the faithful to attend upon the common mind of the bishops, as expressed through the Administrative Board of the National Catholic Welfare Conference. That organization, as their commissioned writers later admitted, did not reflect the structural format which pontifical letters endorsed, but it coincided in sufficient respects to justify the use of Catholic Action as a title for the N.C.W.C. house organ.

In Chicago, a priest-scholar, Reynold Hillenbrand, began in the late 1930's to examine carefully the terminology and theology of Pius XI. He read and studied the pontifical documents in the light of French theological literature which, by the mid-1930's, viewed the classic statements in terms of the structural modifications and techniques which Joseph Cardijn, a Belgian canon, had introduced. Fortuitous contact with two other priests, Louis Putz, C.S.C., and Donald Kanaly, who had respectively worked with the J.O.C. and had personal contact with Cardijn, gave to this man, a charismatic leader, the profound conviction that someone should make

XUM

clear the precise view of lay action which Christ's vicar desired the faithful to understand. He formulated a theological synthesis which joined together an emphasis on liturgy, spirituality, and social reform, and began communicating that ideology to the priests and laymen he could interest. In collaborative efforts with that group, Hillenbrand and Putz worked to develop common programs which could bring together into greater unity the local "cells" which began to develop in the late 1930's and early 1940's. Individuals in close contact with them made the first post-war contacts with the European centers of both general and specialized Catholic Action. Several years of effort to resolve remaining ambiguities issued, by 1949, in three organized movements, the Young Christian Workers, the Young Christian Students, and the Christian Family Movement.

The three specialized movements had established by 1949 national committees and headquarters. Their chaplains and members had also begun to question the advisability of employing "Catholic Action" terminology as a means of establishing their legitimacy. In effect, they were beginning now to define themselves as specialized movements of the lay apostolate. In part, this change stemmed from the advice of European visitors who came to the United States in the immediate post-war years to aid the growth of the cell movement. Proponents of cell action had developed a new international

XUM

viewpoint, and they could grasp the convenience and value of making their terminology identical with that in other English-speaking countries where Jocist-type movements had sunk roots. Eliminating "mandate" from their language and publications removed an important constraint to their plans. Ten years of effort had brought them no closer to a recognition which transformed their apostolate into that of the American hierarchy. Concern with what they saw as a divorce or religion from life convinced them that the movements possessed intrinsic value. If bishops could not be persuaded to accept that view, a less formal approval would suffice.

Those who took leadership roles in forming "general" movements of specialized action had many reasons for incorporating the social inquiry as an essential component of their ideology. No one could deny the fact that Cardijn's movements had spread throughout Europe. Nor was there any evidence of decline. The organizations his associates fostered seemed instead to be growing in numbers and influence. Further, Cardijn was the frequent recipient of pontifical encouragement and support, and his method followed the basic principles of the Thomistic philosophy which the Holy See endorsed. Members of the general committees were aware that some American bishops had not taken kindly to Cardijn, but they took encouragement from the fact that not all members of the hierarchy held that view. Organizers for the

XUM

Young Christian Workers, in particular, had prepared a list of dioceses and bishops which carefully separated potential supporters from antagonists. Operating with the approval of Samuel Cardinal Stritch, they had merely to avoid serious difficulties with the National Catholic Welfare Conference. Even there, they had friends upon whom they could count for assistance.

The national secretariat likewise had good reasons for its preference for a system of national councils. Catholic Action in Italy had been constituted from the outset on the four associations of men, women, boys, and girls. Vatican documents consistently praised such measures as conferences and study circles. So often had pontifical letters stressed the value to the Church in America of the National Catholic Welfare Conference that no doubt could exist that it met with the favor of the Holy See. There were clear signs that the Vatican wanted national hierarchies to group the faithful in organizations which could speak to public issues, so long as they remained submissive to the wishes of ecclesiastical authority.

Both organizational patterns, then, found support in Vatican pronouncements. At mid-century, there was no doubt which pattern possessed more influence. The specialized movements had barely begun regular printing of their inquiry programs, while the N.C.W.C. pamphlets and press releases enjoyed wide distribution. The lay

XUM

movements enrolled several thousands as members, while the affiliated organizations of the N.C.W.C. embraced millions of American Catholics. Officers of the secretariat knew well that the specialized movements in France, Belgium, and Italy were incorporated into the national coordinating agencies. If and when the Y.C.W., Y.C.S., and C.F.M. expanded in numbers and influence, they expected that a comparable step would be taken in the United States.

In fact, the specialized movements did not affiliate with the N.C.W.C. until October, 1960, even though the Christian Family Movement reached a level of national prominence some years before that decision was made. By 1957, the C.F.M. had an estimated 25,000 units and had spread into 150 dioceses in all but six states. The Young Christian Workers had similarly expanded, particularly during the years 1954-1957. At that time it became an affiliated member of the Young Adult Council, the central, nonsectarian United States' organization, officially recognized by the World Assembly of Youth (W.A.Y.), and the spokesman for young Americans as a member of the United States National Commission for UNESCO. And, though the Young Christian Students remained small, its team of national leaders continued both to cooperate with and to battle against the National Federation of Catholic College Students and the Newman Club Federation.

The Holy See had long argued that charity and effectiveness required harmony between the various movements and demanded unity of thought and action. Roman theology argued that the structure of lay organizations must correspond to the organic nature of the Church by setting up groups on a parish, diocesan, and regional level. At the higher levels, there were to be central and federal organizations which could coordinate the local sections of the different movement and promote unity of action and closer union with the hierarchy. Luigi Civardi, for instance, argued in his Manual of Catholic Action that its various forces were not to be disconnected and independent, but coordinated, moving under the impulse of a single directive force. Christ granted his apostles the power to teach, to rule, and to sanctify. Since laymen participated sacramentally in Christ's priesthood, they were to collaborate, according to their status in the Church, in those sacred functions.

Throughout the 1950's, however, prolonged and sometimes heated debate marked the negotiations between N.C.W.C. staff and leaders of the lay movements. On the one side stood Joseph Schieder, director of the Youth Department, Edgar Schmiedeler, O.S.B., and, later, Irving de Blanc, successive directors of the Family Life Bureau. On the other side stood Reynold Hillenbrand and the team of laymen directing the lay movements. At one National

Conference on Catholic Youth Work, Schieder had a resolution introduced which urged priests to call upon the American hierarchy to support official diocesan youth programs in preference to specialized programs. At an institute on Family Life, held at the Catholic University of America, Irving de Blanc suggested that Bishop Bartolome, episcopal moderator of the Family Life Bureau, might veto any non-conforming organization. For his part, Hillenbrand remained adamantly opposed to affiliation with those agencies. He arranged to have the specialized movements affiliate with the Department of Lay Organizations only when it became clear that no other course of action could protect the autonomy of the three movements.

The key elements of the disagreements which marked the decade of the 1950's had slowly developed in the early period of specialized Catholic Action. When leaders of the movements reached a stage where they could distribute thousands of copies of their annual inquiry program, they had a refined ideological framework for their endeavors. Its key element was lay autonomy. Leaders refused to recognize their movements as simply alternative types of Catholic organizations. They distinguished sharply between a movement and an organization. They pursued an "ordered way of life" that aimed at social education and action. Affiliation with the N.C.W.C., they feared, would allow the latter organization

XUM

to formulate policy and to take a leading role in the development of their programs.

The subtle competition between contending plans and principles which first emerged in the 1930's, then, did not subside after the first shocks of social dislocation diminished. Beneath the apparently placid, sometimes monolithic, unity which the Church outwardly exhibited, recurrent crises and controversies were developing behind the outer facade. When Pope John XXIII succeeded to the papacy, these subterranean conflicts began to break out in the open. The "new Catholicism" of the 1960's was novel only in its exterior manifestations. The aggiornamento had been underway for many years, and it required only a simple, peasant pope to bring it out in the open.

XUM

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Abell, Aaron I. *American Catholicism and Social Action: A Search for Social Justice*. rpt. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1960, 1963.

________, ed. *American Catholic Thought on Social Questions*. New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1968.

A Call to Catholic Action: A Series of Conferences on the Principles Which Should Guide Catholics in the Socio-Economic Crisis of Today. New York: J.F. Wagner Co., 1935.

Anderl, Stephen. *The Religious and Catholic Action*. LaCrosse, Wisconsin. St. Rose Convent, 1947.

Bayart, Pierre. *L'Action Catholique Spécialisée*. Paris: Desclee, 1935.

Bedoyere, Michael de la. *Christianity in the Market Place*. Milwaukee: Bruce, 1944.

________. *The Cardijn Story: A Study of the Life of Msgr. Joseph Cardijn and the Young Christian Workers Movement Which He Founded*. Milwaukee: Bruce, 1959.

________. *The Layman in the Church*. London: Burns, Oates, 1954.

Benedictine Monks of Solesmes, comp. *The Lay Apostolate: Papal Teachings*. Boston: Daughters of Saint Paul, 1961.

Bennett, David H. *Demagogues in the Depression: American Radicals and the Union Party, 1932-1936*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1969.

Benson, Robert. *Christ in the Church*. New York: Sheed & Ward, 1941.

XUM

Bishop, Claire H. France Alive. New York: The Declan X. McMullen Co., Inc., 1947.

Bosworth, William A. Catholicism and Crisis in Modern France: French Catholic Groups at the Threshold of the Fifth Republic. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1962.

Broderick, Francis L. The Right Reverend New Dealer John A. Ryan. New York: 1963.

Buehler, CAtherine, comp. A Guide to the Lay Apostolate: Views and Quotations from the Lay Apostolate Congress. New York: Carillon Press, 1954.

Callahan, Daniel. The Mind of the Catholic Layman. New York: Scribners, 1963.

Cardijn, Leon Joseph. La famille dans la vie moderne. Brussels: J.O.C., 1921.

________. Le manuel de la J.O.C. Brussels: J.O.C., 1923.

________. Action Catholique dans la classe ouvrière. Brussels: J.O.C., 1925.

________. La J.O.C. et la paroisse. Brussels: J.O.C., 1925.

________. La J.O.C. et la détresse morale et intellectuelle des jeunes traivailleurs. Brussels: J.O.C., 1930.

________. Les juenes traivailleurs en face du mariage. Brussels: J.O.C., 1932.

________. Ite Missa est. Brussels: J.O.C., 1935.

________. Le laïcat ouvrier. Brussels: J.O.C., 1935.

________. Le travail des jeunes salaries et la charte jociste du travail. Brussels: J.O.C., 1935.

________. La vie morale des jeunes traivailleurs au travail. Brussels: J.O.C., 1935.

________. La J.O.C. Brussels: J.O.C., 1938.

________. Les jeunes traivailleurs face aux temps nouveaux. Brussels: J.O.C., 1942.

________. Official Manual of Jocism. Trans. William Kennedy. San Francisco: The Y.C.W., 1943.

________. *Laymen into Action*. Trans. Anne Heggie. London: G. Chapman, 1964.

Casel, Odo. *Das Christliche Kultmysterium*. Regensburg: Pastet, 1932.

Cavagna, A. *The Pope and Catholic Action*. London: Catholic Truth Society, 1935.

Charbonneau, Joseph. *Catholic Action: Pastoral Letter*. South Bend, Indiana: The Apostolate Press, 1943.

Civardi, Luigi. *Manual of Catholic Action*. Trans. C.C. Martindale. London: Sheed & Ward, 1936.

Conferences in Catholic Action: Proceedings of the Catholic Action Conference, May 23-25, 1937. Milwaukee: 1937.

Confrey, Burton. *Catholic Action: A Textbook for Colleges and Study Clubs*. New York: Benziger, 1935.

Congar, Yves. *Esquisse: Vraie et fausse réforme dans l'Eglise*. Paris: Cerf, 1953.

________. *Jalons pour une théologie du laïcat*. Paris: Cerf, 1953.

________. *Lay People in the Church*. Trans. Donald Attwater. Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1957.

Cossette, Jean Paul. *Catholic Social Work and Catholic Action: A Comparative Study on the Basis of the Lay Apostolate*. Washington: Catholic University Press, 1952.

Crofts, Ambrose M. *Catholic Social Action: Principles, Purpose and Practice*. St. Louis: B. Herder, 1936.

Cronin, John F. *Catholic Social Principles*. Milwaukee: Bruce, 1957.

Dabin, Paul. *L'Apostolat laïque*. Paris: Blot, 1931.

________. *Le Sacerdoce royal de fidèles dans la tradition ancienne et moderne*. Paris: Desclee, 1950.

Day, Dorothy. *House of Hospitality*. New York: Sheed & Ward, 1939.

________. *The Long Loneliness*. New York: Harper and Row, 1952.

________. Loaves and Fishes. New York: Harper and Row, 1963.

Doty, George T. Catholic Action. Toronto: Macmillan, 1927.

Drummond, William F. Social Justice. Milwaukee: Bruce, 1955.

Ellis, John Tracy. A Guide to American Catholic History. Milwaukee: Bruce, 1959.

________. American Catholicism, 2nd ed., rev. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969.

________. Documents of American Catholic History, 2nd ed. Milwaukee: Bruce, 1962.

Fitzsimons, John and Paul McGuire, ed. Restoring All Things: A Guide to Catholic Action. New York: Sheed & Ward, 1938.

Flynn, George Q. American Catholics and the Roosevelt Presidency, 1932-1936. Lexington, Kentucky: University of Kentucky Press, 1968.

Fournier, R. La théologie de l'Action Catholique. Montreal: Grand Sémainaire and Granger Frère, 1940.

Furfey, Paul Hanly. Fire on the Earth. New York: Macmillan, 1936.

________. Three Theories of Society. New York: Macmillan, 1937.

________. The Morality Gap. New York: Macmillan, 1969.

Gavin, Donald B. The National Conference of Catholic Charities. Milwaukee: Bruce, 1962.

Geaney, Dennis J. You Are Not Your Own. Notre Dame, Indiana: Fides, 1954.

Gearty, Patrick W. The Economic Thought of Monsignor John A. Ryan. Washington: Catholic Univeristy Press, 1953.

Geise, Vincent J. The Apostolic Itch. Chicago: Fides, 1954.

Geissler, Eugene S. Training of Lay Leaders: An Introduction to Catholic Action. South Bend, Indiana: Catholic Action Students, 1941.

XUM

Gerken, John D., S.J. Toward a Theology of the Layman. New York: Herder & Herder, 1962.

Gill, Eric. Christianity and the Machine Age. New York: Macmillan, 1940.

Giordani, Igino. The Social Message of the Early Fathers. Paterson, N.J.: St. Anthony Guild, 1944.

Gleason, Philip, ed. Contemporary Catholicism in the United States. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1969.

________. ed. Catholicism in America. New York: Harper & Row, 1970.

Glorieux, Palenon. Corps Mystique et Apostolat. Paris: Libr. de la Jeunesse Ouvrière, 1935.

________. Catholic Action: the Mandated Apostolate. Nevada City, Calif.: Berliner & Lanigan, 1947.

Grandmaison, Leonce de. Jesus Christ: His Person, His Message, His Credentials. New York: Sheed & Ward, 1933.

Greeley, Andrew M. The Catholic Experience: An Interpretation of the History of American Catholicism. New York: Macmillan, 1967.

Gruden, John C. The Mystical Christ: Introduction to the Study of the Supernatural Character of the Church. St. Louis: B. Herder, 1936.

Guardini, Romano. The Church and the Catholic: the Spirit of the Liturgy. New York: Sheed & Ward, 1935.

Guerry, E. L'Action Catholique. 2nd ed. Paris: Desclee de Brouwer, 1936.

Gurian, Waldemar, and M.S. Fitzsimmons. The Catholic Church in World Affairs. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1954.

Haas, Francis J. Man and Society. New York: Appleton-Century, 1930.

Harbrecht, John J. The Lay Apostolate. St. Louis: B. Herder, 1927.

Hebert, A.G. Liturgy and Society. London: Faber & Faber, 1935.

XUM

Hellriegel, M.B. and A.A. Jasper. *The True Basis of Christian Solidarity: the Liturgy an Aid to the Solution of the Social Question*. Trans. William Busch. St. Louis: Central Bureau Press, 1930.

Hesburgh, Theodore. *Theology of Catholic Action*. South Bend, Indiana: Ave Maria Press, 1946.

Hoffman, Ross J. *The Organic State*. New York: Sheed & Ward, 1939.

Huber, Raphael, ed. *Our Bishops Speak: 1919-1951*. Milwaukee: Bruce, 1952.

Husslein, Joseph C. *The Christian Social Manifesto*. Milwaukee: Bruce, 1931.

Jurgensmeier, F. *Der Mystiche Leib Christi als Grundprinzip der Aszetik*, 2nd ed. Paderborn: Schoeningh, 1933.

Kavanagh, W.A. *Lay Participation in Christ's Priesthood*. Washington: Catholic University Press, 1935.

Leclercq, Jacques. *Christian in the World*. New York: Sheed & Ward, 1961.

Lubac, Henri de. *Catholicism*. London: Burns, Oates and Washbourne, 1953.

Lugan, Alphonse. *Social Principles of the Gospel*. Trans. T. Lawrason Riggs. New York: Macmillan, 1928.

Lynn, Rita L. *The National Catholic Community Service: Its Organization, Development, and Termination as a War-Time Service Organization*. Washington: Catholic University Press, d. diss., 1949.

McAvoy, Thomas T. *A History of the Catholic Church in the United States*. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1969.

McGowan, R.A. *Toward Social Justice*. New York: The Paulist Press, [1933].

Man and Modern Secularism: Essays on the Conflict of Two Cultures. New York: National Catholic Alumni Federation, 1940.

Marx, Paul. *Virgil Michel and the Liturgical Movement*. Collegeville, Minn: The Liturgical Press, 1957.

Masse, Benjamin L., S.J., ed. *The Catholic Mind Through Fifty Years*. New York: The America Press, 1952.

XUM

Maurin, Peter. *Easy Essays*. New York: Sheed & Ward, 1942.

________. *The Green Revolution*. Fresno, California: Academy Guild Press, 1949.

Mersch, Emile. *Le Corps Mystique du Christ: Etudes de théologie historique*, 2 vols. Brussels: Museum Lessianum, 1933.

Meyer, Bernard F. *The Mystical Body in Action: A Workbook of Parish Catholic Action*. Herman, Penn.: Center for Men of Christ the King, 1947.

Morlion, Felix A. *The Apostolate of Public Opinion*. Montreal: Fides, 1944.

Mounier, Emmanuel. *Révolution personnaliste et communautaire*. Paris: Esprit Press, 1935.

________. *A Personalist Manifesto*. London: Longman, Green, and Co., 1938.

Munier, Joseph D. *Some American Approximations to Pius XI's "Industries and Professions."* Washington: Catholic University Press, 1943.

Newman, Jeremiah. *What is Catholic Action?* Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1958.

O'Brien, David J. *American Catholics and Social Reform: The New Deal Years*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1968

O'Connor, Daniel. *Catholic Social Doctrine*. Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1956.

O'Connor, William R. *The Layman's Call*. New York: P.J. Kennedy & Sons, 1942.

O'Hara, Edwin V. *The Church and the Country Community*. New York: Macmillan, 1927.

Oldmeadow, Ernest J. *A Layman's Christian Year*. London: Burns, Oates & Washbourne, Ltd., 1938.

Poggi, Gianfranco. *Catholic Action in Italy: The Sociology of a Sponsored Organization*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1967.

Pollet, Vincent M. *L'Action Catholique a la Lumiere de la theologie Thomiste*. Paris: Les Editions Jocistes, 1937.

XUM

Proceedings, First National Catholic Social Action Conference. Milwaukee: Federal Printing Co., 1938.

Proceedings, Second National Catholic Social Action Congress. Cleveland: R.J. McMillan Co., 1939.

Proceedings, Second National Conference on Catholic Youth Work. Washington: N.C.W.C., 1949.

Putz, Louis. *The Modern Apostle*. Chicago: Fides, 1957.

Ryan, John A. *A Living Wage: Its Ethical and Economic Aspects*. New York: Macmillan, 1906.

________. *Distributive Justice: The Right and Wrong of Our Present Distribution of Wealth*. New York: Macmillan, 1916.

________. *Social Reconstruction*. New York: Macmillan, 1920.

________. *A Better Economic Order*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1935.

________. *Social Doctrine in Action: A Personal History*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1941.

Saliege, Jules Cardinal. *Who Shall Bear the Flame?* Chicago: Fides, 1950.

Sasaki, Joseph. *The Lay Apostolate and the Hierarchy*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 1967.

Schmiedeler, Edgar, O.S.B. *A Better Rural Life*. New York: J.F. Wagner, Inc., 1938.

Shaw, J.A. *Edwin V. O'Hara: American Prelate*. New York: Farrar, Strauss, Cudahy, 1957.

Sheehan, Arthur. *Peter Maurin, Lay Believer*. Garden City, N.J.: Doubleday, 1939.

Soras, Alfred de. *Action Catholique et Action Temporelle*. Paris: Edition Spes, 1938.

Suhard, Emmanuel Cardinal. *The Church Today: Growth or Decline?* Notre Dame, Indiana: Fides, 1948.

________. *Priests Among Men*. Chicago: Fides, 1950.

Tavard, George H. *The Church, the Layman and the Modern World*. New York: Macmillan, 1959.

XUM

The Lay Apostolate and the Priest: Talks given at the Fifth Annual Week of Catholic Action Study for Priests, University of Notre Dame, August 4 to 8, 1947. South Bend, Indiana: Fides Publishers, 1947.

The Mind of Christ: An Annotated Bibliography for Catholic Action. Chicago: Fides, 1953.

Tiberghien, Pierre. *Pour Servir.* Paris: J.I.C.F. Edition, 1936.

________, and Putz. *Apostoles of the Front Lines: Looking Ahead with Catholic Action.* South Bend, Indiana: The Apostolate Press, 1943.

Tull, Charles. *Father Coughlin and the New Deal.* Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1965.

Vollmar, Edward R., S.J. *The Catholic Church in America: An Historical Bibliography*, 2nd ed. New York: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1963.

Wakin, Edward and Joseph F. Scheur. *The De-Romanization of the American Catholic Church.* New York: Macmillan, 1966.

Ward, Leo R. *Catholic Life, U.S.A.: Contemporary Lay Movements.* St. Louis: Herder, 1959.

Will, Joseph. *Catholic Action Handbook.* Trans. Kilian J. Hennrich. New York: J.F. Wagner, Inc., 1936.

Witte, Raymond P. *Twenty-Five Years of Crusading: A History of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference.* Des Moines, Iowa: N.C.R.L.C., 1948.

XUM

Pamphlets and Leaflets

Aids to Catholic Action: A Series of Brief Discussions Planned to Promote the Proper Understanding of and Active Participation in the Catholic Action Apostolate. Washington: N.C.W.C., 1933.

Alter, Karl J. *A Program for a Better Social Order*. Toledo: The Chancery Office, 1944.

Anderl, Stephen and Sister Mary Ruth. *The Technique of the Catholic Action Cell Meeting*. La Crosse, Wis.: 1943.

Bauer, Burnett C. *Blueprint for Family Catholic Action*. Notre Dame, Indiana: Ave Maria Press, 1951.

________. *History of the Christian Family Movement*. South Bend, Indiana, 1957 (mimeograph).

Bennett, F., comp. *What Does the Pope Say About Catholic Action? Some Papal Pronouncements*. Sydney, Australia: Pellegrini & Co., Ltd., 1937.

Bibliography on Communism. Washington: N.C.W.C., n.d.

Bishops' Program of Social Reconstruction. 20th Anniversary Edition. Washington: N.C.W.C., 1939.

Brown, George T. *Economic Power in the United States*. New York: The Paulist Press, 1937.

Cameron, R.R. *Directory of Catholic Lay Organizations*. Detroit: Van Antwerp Circulating Library, 1939.

Cardijn, Leon Joseph. *The Church and the Young Worker*. Trans. and intro. Eugene Langdale. London: Young Worker Publications, 1948.

________. *The Spirit of the Young Christian Workers*. Trans. J.A. Coughlin and Walter Meyjes. London: Catholic Truth Society, n.d.

"*Catholic Action*" *and* "*Catholic Activity*". Washington: N.C.W.C., [1936].

Christian Attitude on Social Problems. Washington: N.C.W.C., 1937.

Cicognani, Amleto Giovanni. *A Letter to the Diocesan Youth Directors on the National Catholic Youth Council*. Washington: N.C.W.C., 1941.

Clancy, Matthew. *The Sound Old Guilds*. New York: The Paulist Press, 1939.

Crisis of Christianity: A Statement of the Bishops of The United States, November 14, 1941. Washington: N.C.W.C., 1941.

Crofts, Ambrose M. *Catholic Social Action: Principles, Purposes and Practice*. St. Louis: B. Herder, 1936.

Cronin, John F. *Rugged Individualism*. New York: The Paulist Press, 1937.

[Eisenmenger, Al]. "History of the U.S. Y.C.M." *Y.C.M. Manual*. Chicago: Y.C.M., 1966.

Faulhaber, Michael Cardinal. *The Essential Characteristics of Catholic Action*. St. Louis: Central Bureau Press, 1928.

Fenton, Loretta and Mary Lou Genova. *Four Years in a Cell*. Chicago: Young Christian Workers, 1946.

Ferree, William S. *Introduction to Social Justice*. New York: The Paulist Press, 1946.

________. *Introduction to Catholic Action*. Washington: N.C.W.C., [1942].

________. *Master Pattern for Catholic Action Study: World Problem of Rechristianization and the C-A Solution*. Dayton: University of Dayton, 1948.

Fontenell, R. *Brief Catechism of Catholic Action*. Trans. Round Table Conference of Catholic Action, Weston College. St. Louis: Central Bureau Press, n.d.

For Happier Families: How to Start a C.F.A. Section. Chicago: Chicago Federation of Christian Family Action, 1949.

Gannon, Robert. *The Cardinal Spellman Story*. New York: Doubleday, 1962.

Gavaghan, Thomas A. *Five Years of Work*. [Chicago, 1949].

Geissler, Eugene. *Young Christian Farmer: A Program of Rural Action*. South Bend, Indiana: Fides Publishers, 1947.

Gill, Eric. *Social Principles and Directions Compiled from the Papal Encyclicals*. High Wycombe, England: Hague, Gill and Davey, 1940.

Goulding, Peter. *Collaboration With Christ*. Chicago: Catholic Action Federations, 1957.

Haas, Francis J. Rights and Wrongs in Industry. New York: The Paulist Press, 1933.

________. The American Labor Movement. New York: The Paulist Press, 1933.

________. The Wages and Hours of American Labor. New York: The Paulist Press, 1937.

________. The Why and Whither of Labor Unions. Huntington, Indiana: Our Sunday Visitor Press, 1938.

________. Jobs, Prices and Unions. The Paulist Press, 1941.

Hesburgh, Theodore M. The Mystical Body and the Apostolate: Notes Adapted from Corps Mystique et Apostolat of Chanoine P. Glorieux. South Bend, Indiana: Catholic Action Students, [1941].

Hillenbrand, Reynold. 5 Point Social Program. Chicago: Y.C.W., n.d.

________. The Inquiry. Dayton, Ohio: Catholic Action Reprint No. 109, 1952.

Hunt, John J. Catholic Action -- the Church in Action. San Francisco: Catholic Men of the Archdiocese, 1939.

________. Catholic Action and the Priest. San Francisco: Catholic Men of the Archdiocese, 1940.

Kelvin, Janet. The Task of Woman in the Modern World. Des Moines, Iowa: N.C.R.L.C., 1946.

Lelotte, F. Fundamental Principles of Catholic Action. Trans. J.P. Kelly, 3rd ed. Melbourne, Australia: Australian National Secretariat of Catholic Action, n.d.

Malo, Adrien. L'Action Catholique et Les Oeuvres. Montreal: Edition Fides, 1942.

McCarthy, Edward. How Catholic Action Differs from Catholic Activities. Dayton, Ohio: Catholic Action Reprint No. 45, 1945.

McGowan, R.A. A Cure for Communism. Washington: N.C.W.C., n.d.

________. A Study of Unemployment. Washington: N.C.W.C., n.d.

XUM

________. *Building the Social Order Again: An Annotated Summary of the Encyclical of Pope Pius XI on The Reconstruction of the Social Order*. Detroit: Van Antwerp Circulating Library, 1939.

________. *N.C.W.C. Study Club Outline, based on A Cure for Communism*. Washington: N.C.W.C., n.d.

________. *New Guilds: A Conversation*. The Paulist Press, 1937.

________. *Outline XII: Aids for Study Clubs on Pius XI's "Reconstructing the Social Order"*. Washington: N.C.W.C., n.d.

________. *Toward Social Justice: A Discussion and Application of Pius XI's "Reconstructing the Social Order*." New York: The Paulist Press, [1933].

Michel, Virgil and Louis Traufler. *Why the Mass?* Collegeville, Minn.: The Liturgical Press, 1937.

Michinson, Edward. *Doctrine of Work*. Chicago: Y.C.W., n.d.

Murray, John Courtney. *The Laity: Mediators Between the Spiritual and the Temporal*. Dayton, Ohio: Catholic Action Reprint No. 48, 1945.

National Commission on Catholic Action Study. Dayton, Ohio: N.F.C.C.S., n.d.

O'Toole, James J. *What is Catholic Action*? New York: The Paulist Press, 1940.

Pius XI, Pope. *The Church and Mexico*. Washington: N.C.W.C., 1932.

________. *On the Religious Situation in Mexico*. Washington: N.C.W.C., 1937.

________. *Encyclical Letter on Reconstructing the Social Order*. Washington: N.C.W.C., 1942.

Pius XII, Pope. *Atheistic Communism*. Washington: N.C.W.C., 1937.

________. *The Mystical Body of Christ*. Washington: N.C.W.C., 1943.

________. *The Lay Apostolate -- Its Need Today: Address to the World Congress on the Lay Apostolate, October 14, 1951*. Washington: N.C.W.C., n.d.

________. *Guiding Principles of the Lay Apostolate: Address to the Second World Congress of the Lay Apostolate, October 5, 1957*. Washington: N.C.W.C., n.d.

Pizzardo, Guiseppe Cardinal. *Conferences on Catholic Action*. Washington: N.C.W.C., 1935.

Rank, Chester and Mary Rank. *Catholic Family Action: A Handbook of Technique and Procedure*. Collegeville, Minn.: The Liturgical Press, 1956.

Roy, Henri. *The JOCist Movement.* Manchester, N.H.: J.O.C., 1944.

Rummel, Joseph Francis. *The Church and Social Order: A Summary*. Washington: Catholic Conference on Industrial Problems, 1940.

Ryan, John A. and R.A. McGowan. *A Catechism of the Social Question*. New York: The Paulist Press, 1921.

Ryan, John A. *Social Justice in the 1935 Congress*. Washington: N.C.W.C., 1935.

Saliege, Jules Cardinal. *Catholic Action Takes Flesh.* Dayton, Ohio: Catholic Action Reprint No. 70, 1948.

Simonds, J.D. *The Doctrinal Basis of Catholic Action*. Melbourne, Australia: National Secretariat of Catholic Action, n.d.

Smith, William J. *The Catholic Labor School*. New York: The Paulist Press, 1941.

________. *Is It Catholic Action?* New York: The Paulist Press, 1942.

Suhard, Emmanuel Cardinal. *Social Catholicism*. Dayton, Ohio: Catholic Action Reprint No. 98, 1951.

The Church and Social Order. Washington: N.C.W.C. Administrative Board, 1940.

The National Catholic Welfare Conference: Its Organization, Departments, and Function. Washington: N.C.W.C., 1935.

The N.C.W.C., Agency of the Archbishops and Bishops of the United States for the Promotion of Unity in Catholic Work. Washington: N.C.W.C., 1937.

The Pope and Catholic Action. London: Catholic Truth Society, 1937.

XUM

This is Catholic Action. Melbourne, Australia: The Australian Catholic Truth Society, 1941.

Une Fédération Diocésaine de J.O.C. New Hampshire: Diocèse de Manchester, 1941.

Vance, John G. *The Ladies of the Grail*. London: Catholic Truth Society, 1935.

Victory and Peace: Statement Issued by the Archbishops and Bishops of the United States, November 14, 1942. Washington: N.C.W.C., 1942.

Wendell, Francis N. *The Formation of a Lay Apostle*. New York: Third Order of St. Dominic, 1953.

What Is the Liturgical Movement? Highland Park, Illinois: The Liturgical Conference, 1947.

XUM

Articles

"A Beginning," *Act*, I (October, 1946), 2.

"About the Bulletin," *Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin*, III (November, 1942), 9.

"Across the Country," *Young Christian Workers Business Girls' Bulletin*, I (July-August, 1945), 2.

"Across the Country," *Young Christian Workers Business Girls' Bulletin*, I (September, 1945), 2.

"Action," *Senior Business Girls' Catholic Action Bulletin*, April, 1944, 3.

"Active Role of the Priest in Catholic Action," *Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin*, III (August, 1943), 3-6.

"Adult Cells," *Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin*, V (January, 1946), 53-60.

"Affiliation of Lay Groups with N.C.W.C.: A Statement of General Principles and of Their Particular Application Promulgated at the 1936 Annual General Meeting of the Bishops of the United States," *Catholic Action*, XVIII (December, 1936), 18-21.

"Agenda for Christmas Regional Meeting," *Y.C.S. Bulletin*, I, No. 4 (December, 1947), 3.

Ahern, M.J. "Catholic Church and American Culture," *Catholic Mind*, XXXIV (September 1, 1936), 345-58.

"Alek's Work in Dayton," *Catholic Action Bulletin*, II (November 15, 1941), 2.

Anderson, J.F. "Catholic Action: An Intellectual's Approach," *Christian Social Action*, VI (April, 1941), 137-39.

"A New Year; A New Set of Inquiries," *Leaders' Bulletin*, II (October, 1948), 1.

"Announcing N.C.W.C. Forum Series: Principles for Peace," *Catholic Action*, XXV (August, 1943), 8-10.

"A Pastor Looks at the Parish, Interview with Msgr. Reynold Hillenbrand," *Ave Maria*, LXXXVIII (August 30, 1958), 5-10.

"A Note About the Sections," Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin, V (January, 1945), 10.

"A Plan of Action," Catholic Action Bulletin, II (November 15, 1941), 3.

"Archbishop Mitty Receives Canon Cardijn," The Voice of the Y.C.W., IV (August 1, 1946), 3.

"Attempt to Clarify the Term and the Idea: Catholic Action," Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin, II (April, 1942), 3-5.

Bauer, Burnett C. "Restoring Parish Life Through Lay Action," Integrity, II (March, 1948), 31-34.

________. "C-A, Cana, & South Bend," Forum, IV (November, 1948), 7-11, 19.

Bedoyere, Michael de la. "Catholics in an Expanding World," Catholic World, CXLVII (June, 1938), 266-72.

________. "Catholic Action and the Layman," Month, CLXXIV (September, 1939), 233-40.

________. "Catholic Sectarianism," Thought, XIV (December, 1939), 605-19.

Bernard, Raymond, "American Apostolate: A Review with Marginal Note and Question on Immaturity," Social Order, III (March, 1953), 318-22.

Blake, J. "Inarticulate Laymen," America, XLVIII (March 18, 1932), 571-73.

Bland, Sister Joan. "The New Dimension in United States Catholic History," Records of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia, LXXIII (June, 1962), 3-9.

Boyd, William. "Cell Technique in Catholic Action," Oratre Fratres, XVI (November 30, 1941), 14-21.

________. "Birth of the Catholic Action Cell," Oratre Fratres, XVI (January 25, 1942), 107-15.

Brieg, Joseph A. "Apostle on the Bum," Commonweal, XXVIII (April 29, 1938), 9-12.

Brooks, John. "The Trip," Forum, III (May, 1948), 143-46, 151, 160.

________. "The Trip II," Forum, III (June, 1948), 171-74, 192.

XUM

Bruehl, Charles. "Pius XI and Catholic Action," *Homiletic and Pastoral Review*, XXXIX (June, 1939), 898-906.

"Bulletin," *Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin*, II (December, 1941), 3.

Burns, Bernard. "Catholic Action," *Christian Social Action*, V (January, 1940), 5-9.

Busch, William. "Discussion Clubs for the Clergy," *Oratre Fratres*, XV (December 29, 1940), 49-52.

"CA is Now CFA! Chicago Changes Name and Terms," *Act*, III (February, 1949), 1, 4.

Campbell, P.E. "Catholic Action, A Universal Duty," *Homiletic and Pastoral Review*, XXXII (July, 1932), 1068-1075.

Champion, Raymond J. "Catholic Action," *Catholic Mind*, XXIX (March 8, 1931), 117-24.

"Canon Cardijn's Visit," *America*, LXXV (September 7, 1946), 544.

Cantwell, Daniel M. "The Church and Social Institutions," *Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin*, VII (November, 1948), 59-64.

Caplice, Mary Irene. "We Found *Love* in Paris," *Impact*, I (June, 1946), 3-7.

________. "The Jiciste Congress in Paris," *Oratre Fratres*, XX (October 6, 1946), 520-23.

________. "Frs. Egan, Quinn Named Chaplains," *Act*, I (March, 1947), 1, 3.

"Cardijn Addresses Y.C.W.," *The Voice of the Y.C.W.*, IV (August 1, 1946), 1, 4.

Cardijn, Leon Joseph. "The Church and the Revolution," *Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin*, VI (August, 1947), 5-12.

________. "The Y.C.W. -- The English Speaking World," *Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin*, VII (November, 1948), 51-54.

________. "The Church in the Face of the Workers' Problem," *Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin*, VII (December, 1948), 67.

XUM

________. "A New World Needs a New Apostolate," Address at World Congress on the Lay Apostolate, October 19, 1951, in National Catholic Action Study Commission Bulletin, I (March-April, 1952), 1-5.

"Cardinal's Approval," Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin, V (February, 1946), 67-69.

"Cardinal Suhard on the New Approach," Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin, VIII (September, 1949), 27-30.

Cassidy, Sally Whelan. "Apostle or Apostate," Integrity, II (March, 1948), 2-7.

"Catholic Action and Frustration," The N.C.C.A.S. Bulletin, X (1950-1951), 1-2.

"Catholic Action and Other Parish Works," Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin, II (September, 1942), 4-5.

"Catholic Action and Peace," Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin, IV (April, 1944), 5-7.

"Catholic Action a Social Apostolate," Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin," III (June, 1943), 6.

"Catholic Action is a Lay Apostolate," Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin, III (July, 1943), 3-5.

Catholic Action Library, "Reviews of Current Thought on Catholic Action, Part IV: Catholic Action Groups in the United States," Catholic Action, XXV (April, 1943), 10-11.

"Catholic Action -- Not Catholic Motion," Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin, I (January, 1941), 3-5.

"Catholic Action -- Not Catholic Motion," Catholic Action Leaders' Bulletin, I (January 29, 1941), 7.

"Catholic Action, the Official Lay Apostolate of the Church," Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin, III (September, 1943), 4-5.

"Catholic College Students Plan for Coming Year," Catholic Action, XXIX (June, 1947), 10.

"Catholic Collegiate Congress in Cincinnati," Catholic Action Bulletin, III (October 15, 1942), 5-7.

"Catholic Lay Organizations," Catholic Action, XXIII February, 1941), 8-11.

XUM

"Catholic Reply to Open Letter of 150 Protestant Signers on Spain," Catholic Mind, XXXV (November 22, 1937), 453-469.

"Catholics Across Nation Join in Services of Family Life Conference," Our Sunday Visitor, March 16, 1-2.

"Catholic Worker Program," The Catholic Worker, I (December 15, 1933), 3.

"Catholic Worker Celebrates 3rd Birthday: A Re-Statement of C.W. Aims and Ideals," The Catholic Worker, IV (May, 1936), 1, 6.

"Cell Life," Working Girls' Bulletin, (September, 1943), 3.

"Cells on Family Life Program," Act, I (March, 1947), 1.

"Cell Technique: Liturgy," Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin, II (March, 1942), 5-6.

"Cell Technique: Specialization," Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin, II (April, 1942), 6-7.

"Cell Technique: The Organization of 'Teams,'" Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin, II (July, 1942), 4-5.

"CFA Moves Toward National Unity," Act, III (August 15, 1949), 1, 4.

Champaux, Timothy J. "A Canonical Theory of Catholic Action," The Jurist, I (July, 1941), 225-233.

"Chance for Action," Act, I (March, 1947), 2.

Chapman, Jane Fisher. "The Christian Family Movement," The Grail, XXXII (July, 1950), 18-24.

"Charbonneau's 'Catholic Action,'" Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin, III (September, 1943), 3.

"Checking Up," The Cells, II (April, 1940), 6-7.

"Chicago is Getting Team Conscious," Catholic Action: Bulletin of the Young Business Girls' Federation, I (February, 1944), 1, 3.

"Chicago Officers Are Introduced at Keegan Rally," Act, III (February, 1949), 1.

XUM

Cigognani, Amleto Giovanni. "Holy Father and Catholic Action," Catholic Mind, XXXI (November 8, 1933), 401-07.

"C.I.O. Organizer Pays Us a Visit," Chicago Catholic Worker, I (July, 1938), 1, 3.

Clapp, M.B. "Lay Leadership in Catholic Groups," Catholic Action, XVII (April, 1935), 7-8.

Clark, Hubert J. "Seventy Five Years of American Church History," American Ecclesiastical Review, CLI (August, 1964), 73-96.

Code, J.B. "Catholic Hierarchy and U.S. Culture," Thought, XVI (July, 1941), 224-40.

[Cogley, John]. "The Clergy Go Back to School," Chicago Catholic Worker, I (July, 1938), 1, 4.

"Concord's Contributors for October," Concord, I (October, 1947), [48].

Connolly, Francis X. "The Catholic Writer and Contemporary Culture," Thought, XIV (September, 1939), 373-83.

Conway, Margaret. "N.C.W.C. - Coordination of Youth Activities," Catholic Action, XXVIII (February, 1946), 6-7, 25.

Cooper, John M. "The National Catholic War Council," American Ecclesiastical Review, LIX (1918), 607-17.

Cort, John C. "Nine Years of A.C.T.U.," America, LXXV (April 6, 1946), 4-5.

Coughlin, Charles E. "A Third Party," Vital Speeches of the Day, II (July 1, 1936), 613-16.

"Coughlin Criticizes Cardinal O'Connell," New York Times, December 10, 1934, 3.

"Council Meeting," Leaders' Bulletin, I (May, 1948), 2.

"Courtship of the Business Girl," Catholic Action Business Girls' Bulletin, II (August 25, 1942), 1.

Covarrubias, Javier. "The President's Message," Catholic Action Bulletin, II (March 15, 1942), 2.

[Crowley, Patrick F.] "From the President's Desk," Act, III (February, 1949), 2.

[Cunningham, James]. "Report from the Nation," *The Movement*, I, No. 2 (Winter issue, 1943-1944), 2.

Cunningham, James. "College Students on the Move," *Our Sunday Visitor*, February 2, 1947, 7.

________. "Y.C.W.: My First Year," *Forum*, III (March, 1948), 116-19.

Dargin, Edward V. "Father Coughlin and Canon Law," *Ecclesiastical Review*, XCIII (January, 1935), 29-35.

Day, Dorothy. "On Pilgrimage," *The Catholic Worker*, XIII (July-August, 1946), 1, 2, 7, 8.

________. "The Church and Work," *The Catholic Worker*, XIII (September, 1946), 1, 3, 7, 8.

________. "Peter Maurin, Agitator," *Blackfriars*, XXX (1949), 409-15.

"Dead-End," *Forum*, III (May, 1948), 164.

"Delegates Probe Problems, Methods," *Act*, III (August 15, 1949), 2, 4.

Denise, Sister Mary. "The Catholic High School and Catholic Action, Part I," *Catholic Action*, XXIX (June, 1947), 6-7, 21.

________. "The Catholic High School and Catholic Action, Part II," *Catholic Action*, XXIX (July, 1947), 6-7, 22.

Dernbach, Arthur. "Pilgrims," *Forum*, IV (October, 1948), 13-15.

Deverall, Richard. "John Brophy Speaks," *Christian Front*, II (September, 1937), 225-26.

________. "Catholic Radical Alliance," *Christian Front*, II (October, 1937), 141-43.

________. "How Radical Must We Be?" *Chicago Catholic Worker*, I (September, 1938), 1-2.

"Distributist Groups Swing Into Action," *The Catholic Worker*, IV (November, 1936), 3.

Divine, T.J. "American Catholic Action," *Month*, CLXVI (1935), 221-26.

"Division of Sections," *The Cells*, II (August, 1940), 7.

"Doddridge Farm -- A Challenge," *Action*, I (August 5, 1940), 1-2.

Donnelly, Francis. "The Contributions of Religious to Catholic Action," *Review for Religious*, IV (September, 1945), 318-26.

"Dorothy Day: Lay Apostle to the Poor," *Chicago Catholic Worker*, II (April 25, 1940), 10-12.

"Dorothy Day Writes," *Chicago Catholic Worker*, I (September, 1938), 1.

Dougherty, Frederick J. "The N.F.C.C.S. and the N.C.E.A.," *The National Catholic Educational Association Bulletin*, XLIV (August, 1947), 225-27.

Douglass, James W. "Dorothy Day and the City of God," *Social Justice Review*, LIV (May, 1961), 40-48.

Dowling, Austin. "The National Catholic Welfare Conference," *American Ecclesiastical Review*, LXXIX (1928), 337-354.

Drury, George. "A Common Spiritual Life," *Concord*, I (October, 1937), 19-21.

________. "The Social Teaching of the Popes," *Concord*, I (November, 1947), 28-31.

________. "Spiritual Mission of Y.C.S.," *Concord*, I (January, 1948), 7-11.

________. "Responsibility in Y.C.S.," *Concord*, I (March, 1948), 37-42.

"Editorial," *Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin*, I (January, 1941), 2.

"Editorials," *Act*, II, No. 1 (May, 1948), 2.

"Editor's Note," *The Voice of the Y.C.W.*, I (May 1, 1943), 7.

[Eisenmenger, A.] "A History of the Y.C.M.," Y.C.M. Manual, Chicago: Y.C.M., 1966.

"Example of an Inquiry: Impure Language in the Shop," *Factory Workers' Catholic Action*, I (February, 1942), 4.

"Excerpts from the Apostolic Constitution On the Sodality of Our Lady," *Catholic Action Notes*, II, No. 2 (1949), 1.

"Family Apostolate at Work Now in 20 Different Cities," *Act*, III (February, 1949), 1, 4.

"Farm Commune," *Chicago Catholic Worker*, I (May, 1939), 1.

"Farming Commune," *The Catholic Worker*, II (March, 1935), 5.

"Farming Commune is Finally Underway: Workers Planting Now: More Ready to Go," *The Catholic Worker*, IV (May, 1936), 1.

[Farrell, Martin]. "Spirit of Catholic Action," *Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin*, II (December, 1941), 4-5.

________. "The Spirit of Catholic Action," *Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin*, II (November, 1941), 4-5.

________. "A New Pamphlet," *Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin*, II (August, 1942), 9.

"Father Coughlin's Sunday Radio Talk," *Social Justice*, I (March 13, 1936), 8-10.

"Father Mooney's Letter," *Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin*, II (November, 1941), 9.

"Federation Bulletins," *Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin*, II (November, 1941), 7.

Fenerty, C.C. "Duty of Catholic Laymen to Their Church," *N.C.W.C. Review*, XII (November, 1930), 11-12.

Ferland, A. "Priesthood of the Laity: the Foundation of Catholic Action," *Oratre Fratres*, XVI (October 5, 1941), 496-509.

Ferrand, John. "Toward a Theology of the Laity," *Anima*, VI (Summer, 1955), 1-19.

Ferree, William. "The Role of the University in Catholic Action," *National Catholic Education Association Proceedings*, XXXVI (1939), 186-198.

________. "Catholic Action in the Catholic College and University," *Journal of Religious Instruction*, X (September, 1940), 46-59.

Fitzsimons, John. "Y.C.W. in England," *Our Sunday Visitor*, May 4, 1947, 7-8.

________. "Pius XII and the Apostolate of the Laity," *Clergy Review*, XXIII (Summer, 1958), 530-39.

XUM

Flannery, Harry W. "N.C.W.C. -- Voice of America's Bishops.," *Ave Maria*, LXXXVII (June 7, 1958), 5-8.

"Flash to Ponca City," *The Cells*, II (April, 1940), 6.

Foley, Albert, S.J. "Cell Technique of Catholic Action," *Review for Religious*, II (May 15, 1943), 164-175.

"Foreign News," *The Cells*, II (June, 1940), 4-5.

"Foreign News," *The Cells*, II (September, 1940), 8-9.

"For Pastors," *Catholic Action*, XXVIII (April, 1946), 21.

"French Bishops' Plan," *Forum*, IV (October, 1948), 7-9.

"From One CA Student to Another," *Leaders' Bulletin*, III (March, 1943), 6-8.

"Full Time Chaplains for Catholic Action," *Young Christian Workers Office Workers' Bulletin*, III (October, 1946), 1.

Furfey, Paul Hanly. "The Challenge of Modern Thought to Neo-Scholasticism," *Proceedings of the American Catholic Philosophical Association*, XII (1936), 45-58.

________. "The New Social Catholicism," *Christian Front*, I (December, 1936), 181-84.

________. "Voluntary Poverty," *Christian Social Action*, V (February, 1940), 49-53.

________. "Personalist Social Action in *Rerum Novarum* and *Quadregesimo Anno*," *American Catholic Sociological Review*, II (December, 1941), 204-216.

________. "The Clergy and Laity in Catholic Action," *The Catholic University of America Bulletin*, XVIII (September, 1950), 5-8.

Geaney, Denis. "The Liturgy in the Cell Meeting," *Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin*, V (July, 1947), 192-95.

________. "Reflection on Growth or Decline," *Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin*, VIII (October, 1949), 35-37.

________. "The Chicago Story," *Chicago Studies: An Archdiocesan Review*, II (Winter, 1963), 287-300.

"General Study Week," *Y.C.W. Bulletin*, [January, 1948], 1.

XUM

Giese, Vincent J. "The Lay Apostolate in Chicago," Apostolic Perspectives, I (Summer, 1956), 8-15, 22.

Gleason, Philip. "Mass and Maypole Revisited: American Catholics and the Middle Ages," The Catholic Historical Review, LVII (July, 1971), 249-274.

Glorieux, Palenon. "L'Action Catholique et L'enseignment dogmatique," Vie Intellectuelle, XXVIII (1934), 356-81.

Gorke, Tess Marie. "Catholic Collegiate Congress Makes History," Catholic Action, XXV (February, 1943), 6-7 ff.

Gray, Sister Mary Alexander. "Development of the Newman Club Movement, 1893-1961," Records of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia, LXXIV (June, 1963), 70-128.

Harbrecht, John C. "Christian Solidarism," Christian Social Action, VI (April, 1941), 131-36.

Hart, Charles A. "Catholic Action and the Catholic College," Catholic Action, XXVIII (August, 1946), 6-7; and (September, 1946), 6-8.

"Havana Week," Catholic Action Notes, II, No. 2 (1949), 8.

Hennrich, Kilian J. "Varia," Homiletic and Pastoral Review, XLIII (February, 1943), 480.

Hewitt, Jean F. "Prague Postscript," Catholic Action, XXIX (January, 1947), 6, 23.

"High School Boys," Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin, V (May, 1947), 155-57.

"History of Men's Cells," Act: A Quarterly of Adult Catholic Action, I (October, 1946), 1, 3-4.

"Houses of Hospitality Real Need Today," The Catholic Worker, I (February 1, 1934), 5.

"How Are We Progressing?" Catholic Action Leaders' Bulletin, I (July, 1941), 1.

"How CA Operates in Cleveland," Act, II, No. 1 (May, 1948), 1, 4.

"Importance of the 'The Common Good,'" Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin, III (August, 1943), 8-9.

"Important Announcement," Columbia, XVIII (November, 1938), 3.

"Individualism: Unity in the Cell and in the Federation," Catholic Action Business Girls' Bulletin, II (September 25, 1942), 1.

"In Politics?" Social Justice, I (March 13, 1935), 4.

"Inquiry: Common Good in the Business World," Senior Business Girls' Catholic Action Bulletin, March, 1944, 1, 4.

"International Visitors," Leaders' Bulletin, II (December, 1948), 1.

Julien, Claude. "Vision of the World," Concord, I (November, 1947), 10-15.

Kanaly, D.J. "70,000 Apostles Come to Paris," Homiletic and Pastoral Review, XXXVIII (October, 1937), 42-45.

Kane, John J. "The Social Structure of American Catholics," American Catholic Sociological Review, XVI (March, 1955), 23-40.

________. "Church and the Laity -- Among Catholics," Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences, CCCXXXII (1960), 50-59.

Keating, J. "Thinking With the Church," Month, CLXXIII (February, 1939), 164-67.

Keegan, Patrick. "The Y.C.W. An Indivisible Whole," Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin, V (July, 1947), 185-191.

Kenkel, Frederick P. "The Social Question to the Fore," Centrall-Blatt and Social Justice, XXXII (February, 1940), 348-49.

Kennard, Frank. "Portland Report," The Forum, III (November, 1947), 42-43.

"Kind of Cell Members We Want," Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin, II (December, 1941), 3-4.

"LaCrosse Letter," Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin, III (July, 1943), 7-8.

LaFarge, John. "Real Catholic Action Emerges from Fog of Generalities," America, LXVI (February 7, 1942), 481-82.

"Last Meeting," Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin, II (December, 1941), 4.

"Last Meeting," Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin, II (July, 1942), 3.

Lawrence, Emeric A. "Father of the Miracle: A Tribute to Canon Cardijn, " Oratre Fratres, XX (October 6, 1946), 513-15.

"Leisure Time of the Young American Girl," Catholic Action Working Girls' Bulletin, II (January, 1942), 2-3.

"Leisure Time of the Young American Girl: Dates," Catholic Action Working Girls; Bulletin, II (April 25, 1942), 2-3.

"Leisure Time of the Young American Girl: Clothes and Drinking," Catholic Action Working Girls' Bulletin, II (May 25, 1942), 1-2.

"Leisure Time of the Business Girl: Body Beautiful," Catholic Action Business Girls" Bulletin, II (July 25, 1942), 1.

"Letter from Australia," Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin, III (February, 1943), 10.

"Let Us Work Together," The Cells, II (April, 1940), 405.

Lewis, David L. "Emmanuel Mounier and the Politics of Moral Revolution: Aspects of Political Crises in French Liberal Catholicism, 1935-1938," The Catholic Historical Review, LVI (July, 1970), 266-290.

"Like to Like," Catholic Action Leaders' Bulletin, I (March, 1941), 1-3.

Lillis, T.F. "Need of Catholic Laymen's Organizations," N.C.W.C. Review, XII (January, 1930), 16-17.

Loeffler, James D. "The Basis of Catholic Action," America, LI (July 7, 1934), 294-96.

________. "Catholic Action Coordinated," America, LIV (February 8, 1936), 422-434.

"Looking Ahead," Leaders' Bulletin, III (March, 1943), 1-5.

"Main Ideas: Three Characteristics," Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin, V (March, 1945), 35-43.

Maiolo, John R., William V. D'Antonio and William T. Liu, "Source and Management of Strain in a Social Movement: Some Preliminary Observations," Sociological Analysis, XXIX, No. 2 (Summer, 1968), 67-78.

XUM

"Making the Inquiry," Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin, IV (November, 1943), 6-8.

Mannix, Mary. "Christian Socialism in Europe," Impact, II (March, April, 1947), 17-19.

[Marciniak, Edward]. "A Program of Action: Statement of Aims," Work, I (July, 1943), 1-2.

[Marhoefer, Charles J.]. "A Letter: Business Men's Cells," Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin, III (July, 1943), 6-7.

________. "An Approach to the College," Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin, VII (December, 1948), 73-78.

Maurin, Peter. "To The Bishops of the United States: A Plea for Houses of Hospitality," The Catholic Worker, I (October, 1933), 1.

________. "Christ the King Alone Can Reconstruct the World," The Catholic Worker, II (October, 1934), 1, 6.

________. "A Program for Immediate Needs," The Catholic Worker, II (January, 1935), 1, 7.

________. "Communitarian Personalism," The Catholic Worker, IV (September, 1936), 1, 6.

________, and John Cummings. "Is Political Action an Answer?" The Catholic Worker, II (June, 1934), 6.

"May Study Topic: Pope Pius XI on Reconstructing the Social Order," Catholic Action, XIX (May, 1937), 23-25.

McAvoy, Thomas T. "Catholic Church in the United States Between Two Wars," Review of Politics, IV (October, 1942), 409-431.

McDonough, Frank J. "Zeal of Youthful Catholics Miracle of 20th Century says Priest-J.O.C. Leader," The New World, June 14, 1940, 11-12.

McGinley, Dorothy. "Cardijn, Apostle of the Workers," Impact, I (September-October, 1946), 15-20.

McGowan, R.A. "Philosophy of Catholicism in Its Relation to Industry," N.C.W.C. Review, XIII (May, 1931), 9-10.

________. "Working for a New Social Order," Catholic Action, XIV (May, 1932), 22-23.

________. "Intellectual Preparation for Catholic Action," Catholic Action, XIV (August, 1932), 13-14.

________. "The Priest and the Industrial Crisis," *Ecclesiastical Review*, LXXXIX (September, 1933), 225-234.

________. "Clergy Hails Schools of Social Action," *Catholic Action*, XIX (August, 1937), 16-17.

________. "Government and Social Justice," *Catholic Mind*, XXXVI (June 8, 1938), 222-26.

"McGuire at Kenrick," *The Forum*, II (December, 1946), 16-17.

McGuire, Paul. "Preparation for Catholic Action," *Sign*, XVIII (October, 1938), 140-43.

________. "The Method of Catholic Action," *Columbia*, XVIII (January, 1939), 3, 18.

________. "Pope of Catholic Action," *Sign*, XVIII (April, 1939), 548-550.

________. "The State of the Church under Pius XI," *Columbia*, XVIII (April, 1939), 9, 22.

________. "The Catholic Opportunity in Modern America," *Columbia*, XVIII (August, 1939), 7, 17.

________. "March of Catholic Action," *Columbia*, XIX (October, 1939), 10, 18.

________. "Group in Catholic Action," *Sign*, XX (September, 1940), 93-95.

McKenna, Norman. "Pax Romana in America," *Columbia*, XIX (October, 1939), 12, 17.

________. "The Story of the A.C.T.U.," *Catholic World*, CLXVIII (1949), 453-59.

McLarney, A. "Lay Thought on American Catholic Action," *Blackfriars*, XVI (July, 1935), 495-506.

McLaughlin, Martin M. "An International Union of Students," *Our Sunday Visitor*," March 16, 1947, 7.

________. "Catholic College Students in International Student Affairs," *The National Catholic Educational Association Bulletin*, XLIV (August, 1947), 234-41.

________. "The Student World: Report from Madison," *Concord*, I (November, 1947), 41-42.

McMahon, Charles A. "National Catholic Welfare Conference," *Sign*, XVI (1936), 91-93.

XUM

McNelly, Willis. "Social Justice Needs Social Charity," _Concord_, I (December, 1947), 39-40.

[Meinecke, Paul]. "In Defense of the Y.C.W.," _The Voice of the Y.C.W._, 10-11.

Michel, Virgil. "The Laymen in the Church," _Commonweal_, XIV (June 4, 1930), 123-25.

________. "Social Aspects of the Liturgy," _Catholic Action_, XVI (May, 1934), 9-11.

________. "The Liturgical Movement and the Future," _America_, LIV (October, 1938), 24.

[Monheim, Lawrence]. "Personal Reflections on Priests' Meeting by One Who Was Present," _Catholic Action Bulletin_, IV (October, 1943), 6.

"Month by Month with the N.C.W.C.," _Catholic Action_, XXIV (March, 1942), 14.

Mooney, Vincent. "Leads for Leaders," _Our Sunday Visitor_, February 18, 1940, 7-8.

________. "Leads for Leaders," _Our Sunday Visitor_, March 10, 1940, 7-8.

________. "Leads for Leaders: Catholic Youth Council," _Our Sunday Visitor_, November 23, 1941, 7-8.

"More About the Council Meeting," _Leaders' Bulletin for Y.C.W. Girls_, I, No. 5 (February, 1948), 1-2.

Morrissey, William J. "Study Week Impressions," _Forum_, III (December, 1947), 47-50, 58.

Murray, John Courtney. "Operation University," _America_, LXXV (April 13, 1946), 28-29.

"Music: Jumpin' Jive," _Catholic Action Working Boys' Bulletin_, I (July, 1942), 4.

"N.C.W.C. Adds to Catholic Social Studies," _Catholic Action_, XIX (May, 1937), 21.

"N.C.W.C. Episcopal Reports," _Catholic Action_, XXV (December, 1943), 9-18.

"N.C.W.C. Reports for the Year 1946," _Catholic Action_, XXVIII (December, 1946), 10-17.

"N.C.W.C. Reports to General Meeting of Bishops," _Catholic Action_, XXIX (January, 1947), 6-12.

XUM

"N.C.W.C. Study Club Committee Elects New Chairman for Coming Year," *Catholic Action*, XXV (August, 1944), 17.

"National Catholic Youth Congress," *Action*, I (August 5, 1940), 1.

"National Council of Catholic Men," *Catholic Action*, XXV, (September, 1943), 18-21.

"N.F.C.C.S. Meeting in Chicago," *Catholic Action*, XXVI, (February, 1944), 23.

"N.F.C.C.S. Needs CA," *The Movement*, I, No. 3 (Spring, 1944), 3.

"National Meet at Chicago in June," *Act*, III (February, 1949), 3.

"National Youth Conference," *Catholic Action*, XXIX (June, 1947), 8-10.

"Need of Lay Leaders," *Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin*, II (March, 1942), 3-4.

"New Quarters," *Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin*, IV (October, 1943), 3.

Newton, Craig A. "Father Coughlin and His National Union for Social Justice," *Southwestern Social Science Quarterly*, XLI (December, 1960), 341-49.

"New Volume of the Bulletin," *Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin*, IV (October, 1943), 2.

"New York Experiment Built Around C.A. Groups," *Act*, II, No. 1 (May, 1948), 4.

"Notre Dame Bulletin on 'The Common Good,'" *Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin*, III (August, 1943), 9-11.

"Notre Dame Study Days," *Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin*, II (May, 1942), 8-9.

O'Brien, David J. "American Catholocism and the Diaspora," *Cross Currents*, XVI (Summer, 1966), 307-324.

________. "American Catholics and Organized Labor in the 1930's," *Catholic Historical Review*, LI (October, 1966), 323-349.

________. "American Catholic Historiography: A Post-Conciliar Evaluation," *Church History*, XXXVII (March, 1968), 80-94.

XUM

"Observe, Judge, and Act," Catholic Action Bulletin, II (November 15, 1941), 4.

O'Connor, John J. "Catholic Action Program Must Use Modern Methods," America, LXVII (April 24, 1942), 68-69.

________. "Action for God," The Catholic Mind, XL (August 22, 1942), 1-9.

Ojala, Suzanne. "Dear Leaders," Catholic Action Working Girls' Bulletin, II (January 7, 1942), 1.

Ollivier, Patricia. "What is a Movement?" Concord, I (October, 1947), 24-28.

________ and Martin M. McLaughlin, "Dear Students," Y.C.S. Bulletin, I (December, 1947), 1-2.

"On the Front Lines," Catholic Action, XXVI (April, 1944), 21.

O'Toole, James J. "Editorial," The Cells, II (April, 1940), 1.

"Our Bulletin," Catholic Action Bulletin, IV (December 15, 1943), 2-3.

"Our Common Catholic Interests," Catholic Action, XXXVIII (October, 1946), 3-4.

"Our Program," Action, I (September 4, 1940), 5.

"Our Visitor from Montreal, Miss Alek Leduc," Catholic Action Bulletin, II (November, 14, 1941), 1.

Paul, Martin. "Novenites At It Again! Launch Catholic Action Movement," Chicago Catholic Worker, II (June, 1939), 3.

"Personalism and Communitarianism," The Catholic Worker, IV (October, 1936), 8.

"Plan for Closer Cooperation of Lay Groups on Youth Announced," Catholic Action, XXV (January, 1943), 13.

"Planned Inquiries," Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin, III (July, 1943), 8-9.

"Points for Perusal: The Catholic Worker Program, Personalism," Chicago Catholic Worker, I (September, 1938), 4.

"Points for Perusal: The Catholic Worker Program, Works of Mercy," *Chicago Catholic Worker*, I (October, 1938), 2.

"Practical Suggestions for a Student Community," *Concord*, I (October, 1947), 22-23.

"Priests' Study Week, October 5-6-7, 1943," *Catholic Action Bulletin*, IV (October, 1943), 4.

"Priests' Study Week," *Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin*, VI (August, 1947), 15.

"Private Audience in Rome!" *Impact*, I (June, 1946), 1.

Purcell, Richard J. "John A. Ryan: 1869-1945," *Studies*, XXXV (1946), 153-171.

[Putz, Louis]. "Place of the Priest in Catholic Action," *Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin*, II (January, 1942), 3-5.

________. "Our Credo," *Our Sunday Visitor*, January 12, 1947, 7.

________. "And the Greatest of These...," *Concord*, I (January, 1948), 23-27.

________. "Ideological Development in Y.C.S." *Anima Newsletter*, n.d., 5-6.

________. "The FIDES Story," *The Ave Maria*, LXXXVI (February 11, 1956), 8-11ff.

Quinn, William. "Reviews of the Apostolate: Social Action Survey," *Apostolic Perspectives*, I (Fall, 1956), 26-29.

"Radio Challenge to Nation First Word of New Party," *Social Justice*, I (June 22, 1936), 3.

Rahner, Karl. "The Lay Apostolate," *Cross Current*, VII (Summer, 1957), 225-246.

Ready, Michael J. "Unity Through Lay Organizations," *Catholic Action*, XXIII (February, 1941), 28.

"Rebuilding for Christ, Article VI: Building Youth Leadership," *Catholic Action*, XXVIII (February, 1946), 10-12.

"Recent Papal Pronouncements," *Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin*, VIII (November, 1949), 62-63.

XUM

Reese, Thomas. "The Apostolate -- A Living Thing," Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin, VIII (October, 1949), 45-47.

"Regional Study Weeks," Forum, III (June, 1948), 180-81, 191.

"Resume," Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin, III, (February, 1943), 4.

"Review of Activities," Catholic Action Bulletin, II (March 15, 1942), 8.

Reynolds, E.P. "Catholic or Roman Catholic?" Catholic Mind, XXXIV (September 8, 1936), 358-361.

[Reynolds, Robert, Richard Walker and Joanne Guendling]. "Policy Defined," The Movement, I, No. 3 (Spring issue, 1944), 4.

Reynolds, Robert. "With or Without?" Concord, I (October, 1947), 2-3.

Russell, William H. "The Catholic Evidence Guild in the United States," Lumen Vitae, III (1948), 300-315.

Saliege, Jules Cardinal. "Catholic Action in the Flesh," Concord, I (March, 1948), 6-8.

Schieder, Joseph E. "Catholic Youth Organized -- Strong, Powerful, Forward-looking -- 1955," National Catholic Education Association Bulletin, LI (February, 1955), 16-30.

Schuyler, J.B. "The Role of the Laity in the Catholic Church," American Catholic Sociological Review, XX (Winter, 1959), 290-307.

"Second General Council Meeting Held in Scranton," Leaders' Bulletin for Y.C.W. Girls, I (May, 1948), 1, 3.

"Secularism: Challenge to Christians: Article III, Youth in a Secularized World," Catholic Action, XXVIII (November, 1946), 8-10, 23.

"Seminarians' Catholic Action Week-End," Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin, II (September, 1942), 7.

"Seminarians Study," Forum, IV (October, 1948), 15-17.

Senser, Bob. "School for Workers," Concord, I (March, 1948), 1-5.

Shenton, James P. "The Coughlin Movement and the New Deal," *Political Science Quarterly*, LXXIII (September, 1958), 353-73.

"Six Mois D'Activite Jociste Internationale," *Bulletin d'information no. 3, janivier, 1947*, 4-6.

Smith, Jim. "The National Student Association," *Concord*, I (November, 1947), 4-9.

"Social Action Schools for the Clergy," *Catholic Action*, XIX (May, 1937), 20.

"Some Facts That We Discovered at the Study Week in Chicago," *Catholic Action Bulletin*, IV (October, 1943), 4-5.

Sommers, Joseph V. "Specialized Catholic Action Follows the Leader," *The American Ecclesiastical Review*, CLIV (May, 1946), 327-339.

"Specific Problem Study Thru the Inquiry," *Chicago College Men's Bulletin*, I (March 27, 1942), 6.

Spitzer, Allen. "The Cultural Organization of Catholicism," *American Catholic Sociological Review*, XIX (1958), 2-12.

"State Street on Saturday Night," *Catholic Action Business Girls' Bulletin*, II (November, 1942), 1-3.

"Study Week at Notre Dame," *Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin*, III (May, 1943), 9-10.

"Study Weeks," *Forum*, III (January-February, 1948), 75-76.

Taft, Philip. "The Association of Catholic Trade Unionists," *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, II (January, 1949) 210-18.

Tanner, Paul F. "Milwaukee's First Catholic Action Conference," *Catholic Action*, XIX (July, 1937), 11-12.

________. "The Foundation of a Catholic Youth Organization," *Our Sunday Visitor*, October 28, 1939, 4-5.

________. "The National Catholic Youth Council," *Homiletic and Pastoral Review*, XLI (June, 1941), 933-36.

"Team and Teamwork," *Y.C.S. Bulletin*, I, No. 4 (December, 1947), 12-13.

"The Archbishop on Catholic Action," *Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin*, II (October, 1941), 1-2.

"The Cana Conference of Chicago," *Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin*, V (June, 1947), 171-75.

"The Catholic Action Apostolate Needed," *Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin*, III (May, 1943), 3-5.

"The Chaplains' Corner," *Act*, III (May 15, 1949), 4.

"The Common Good, Part III," *Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin*, IV (April, 1944), 7-8.

"The Confraternity and Catholic Action," *Catholic Action Notes*, II, No. 2 (1949), 8.

"The First U.S. Archdiocesan Program of Catholic Action," *Catholic Action*, XXII (November, 1940), 28-29.

"The Grail," *Action*, I (August 5, 1940), 3.

"The Green Light," *The Couplet*, I, No. 3 (May, 1946), 1-2.

"The Institutional Apostolate," *Y.C.S. Bulletin*, III, No. 2 (November, 1948), 3.

"The Latest Fashion Hits Chicago," *Young Christian Workers Business Girls' Bulletin*, I (May, 1945), 1.

"The Liturgical Summer School for Priests," *Oratre Fratres*, XV (September 7, 1941), 470-72.

"The Mind of Christ: An Annotated Bibliography of Catholic Action -- Revised," *Apostolic Perspectives*, II (Winter, 1957), 2-24.

"The N.F.C.C.S." *Proceedings, National Catholic Education Association*, XXXIX (1942), 251-54.

"The Organization of Catholic Action," *Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin*, III (October, 1942), 5-8.

"The Parish and Catholic Action," *Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin*, III (April, 1943), 5-7.

"The Problem of the Masses," *Y.C.W. Bulletin for Cell Members*, III (May, 1947), 1.

"The Program for the Year: Integration of Studies in Life," *Y.C.S. Bulletin*, I, No. 2 (November, 1947), 1-4.

"The Program of the National Catholic Action Study Commission, 1951-52," *National Catholic Action Study Commission Bulletin*, I (November, 1951), 1-4.

XUM

"The Selection and Training of Leaders," *Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin*, IV (April, 1944), 4-5.

"The Spirit of Conquest," *Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin*, IV (November, 1943), 2-3.

"The Student World," *Concord*, I (October, 1947), 29-33.

"The Student World," *Concord: A Magazine for the Student Community*, I (December, 1947), 37-38.

"The Terminology of Catholic Action," *Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin*, V (January, 1945), 3-9.

"The University of Dayton's Part in the Field of Official Catholic Action," *Catholic Action Bulletin*, IV (September 15, 1943), 3-5.

"The Weapon Against Secularism," *Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin*, III (January, 1943), 6-7.

"The Work with the Workers," *Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin*, V (March, 1946), 83-88.

"They're Back!" *Young Christian Workers Office Workers' Bulletin*, II (June-July, 1946), 1.

"This Business of Running a Study Week," *Young Christian Workers Business Girls' Bulletin*, I (September, 1945), 1.

"This is Our Plan," *Catholic Action Bulletin for Business Girls*, I (November, 1944), 1-2.

"To Catholic Unionists," *Chicago Catholic Worker*, I (October, 1938), 1.

"To Our Readers," *The Catholic Worker*, I (May 1, 1933), 4.

"Training for Leaders," *Catholic Action Bulletin*, II (November 15, 1941), 10.

"Two Periodicals Make First Appearance: Other Publications are Coming Soon," *The Movement*, I, No. 2 (Winter issue, 1943-1944), 1.

"Unfederated Cells," *Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin*, III (October, 1942), 3.

"Unified Catholic Action, Report of the Episcopal Committee on Catholic Action in Australia," *Catholic Mind*, XXXIX (December 8, 1941), 11-14.

XUM

Valaik, John D. "Catholics, Neutrality, and the Spanish Embargo, 1937-1939," *The Journal of American History*, LIV (June, 1967), 73-85.

_______. "American Catholics and the Second Spanish Republic, 1931-1936," *Journal of Church and State*, X (Winter, 1968), 13-28.

"Victory Declared," *Young Christian Workers Business Girls' Bulletin*, I (September, 1945), 2.

Ward, Patrick J. "The N.C.W.C. and Catholic Action," *Catholic Action*, XV (May, 1933), 1-3.

Ward, Richard J. "The Role of the Association of Catholic Trade Unionists in the Labor Movement," *Review of Social Economy*, XIV (September, 1956), 79-100.

Watson, Youree. "Leadership in Catholic Action," *Review for Religious*, II (September 15, 1943), 312-326.

Weber, G. "To the Editor," *Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin*, VIII (November, 1949), 63-64.

"We Face the Future: Article I: Catholic Action -- Sword and Shield," *Catholic Action*, XXVI (September, 1944), 8-10.

"We Must Get This Over," *Catholic Action Leaders' Bulletin*, I (May, 1941), 5-7.

"What is Catholic Action?" *Catholic Action Leaders' Bulletin*, I (July, 1941), 3-5.

"What is the Solution?" *Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin*, II (February, 1942), 5-7.

"What We Are Doing in Town and Country," *The Catholic Worker*, IV (September, 1936), 2.

"Which Way Catholic Action Study Commission," *The N.C.C.A.S. Bulletin*, X (1950-1951), 3-6.

Willock, Ed. "Toward Peace in the Lay Apostolate," *Integrity*, III (December, 1948), 16-23.

"Workshop for Priests," *Catholic Action Notes*, II, No. 21, (April, 1949), 8.

Woywood, S. "Societies of Catholics are not Necessarily Ecclesiastical Organizations," *Homiletic and Pastoral Review*, XL (February, 1940), 517-18.

XUM

Wuenschel, Edward A. "Catholic Action in the Seminaries," *Proceedings, Third Annual Meeting, The Catholic Theological Society of America*, III (1948), 15-21.

"Y.C.S. - A Secret Society?" *Y.C.S. Bulletin*, I, No. 2, (November, 1947), 9.

"Y.C.W. Leaders Begin New Year's Work," *Young Christian Workers Office Workers' Bulletin*, III (October, 1946), 2.

"Youth Conference," *J.C.S.A. Newsletter*, I (April 9, 1947), 3.

Unpublished Material

Betten, Neil. "Catholicism and the Industrial Worker During the Great Depression." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1968.

Buser, Mary Ann. "Techniques of Catholic Action for the Secondary School." Unpublished Master's thesis, Catholic University of America, 1951.

Cassidy, Sally W. "Some Aspects of Lay Leadership." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1959.

Cerny, Karl H. "Monsignor John A. Ryan and the Social Action Department." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University, 1954.

Cour, Francis. "Catholic Action and Politics in the Writings of Pope Pius XI." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Notre Dame, 1952.

Forster, William P. "Michael J. O'Shaugnessy and His Reform Program: A Catholic Businessman's Interpretation of the Papal Program for a New Social Order." Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Notre Dame, 1965.

Hermann, Sister Mary. _History of the Toledo Y.C.S._ Toledo: mimeograph, 1954.

Karrer, Walter C. "The Episcopal Mandate in Catholic Action." Unpublished Master's thesis, Catholic University, 1950.

Maiolo, John, et. al. _The Christian Family Movement: A Profile, Report No. I, From the Notre Dame Study of CFM, Background and Development of the Movement._ South Bend, Indiana: the authors, mimeograph, 1968.

Maly, Raymond J. "The Catholic Labor Alliance: A Laboratory Test of Catholic Social Action." Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Notre Dame, 1950.

Schultz, James P. "An Analysis of the Technique and Present Status of the Young Christian Students, Young Christian Workers, and the Christian Family Movement in the United States." Unpublished Master's thesis, St. Louis University, 1956.

XUM

Soderberg, M.A. "The Politics of Catholic Youth: A Comparative Study of the Young Christian Workers." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Catholic University, 1965.

Summary of Lectures, Summer School of Social Action for the Clergy, Conducted at St. Francis Seminary, St. Francis, Wisconsin, July 5-30, 1937. 2 vols. Milwaukee: St. Francis Seminary, mimeograph, 1937.

Summer School of Social Action for Priests, 4 vols. Mundelein, Illinois: St. Mary of the Lake Seminary, mimeograph, 1938.

XUM

Manuscript Collections

Catholic Adult Education Centers Papers, Chicago Historical Society, Chicago, Illinois.

Catholic Association for International Peace Papers, Marquette Memorial Library Archives, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

Catholic Council on Working Life Papers, Chicago Historical Society, Chicago, Illinois.

Christian Family Movement Papers, University of Notre Dame Archives, Notre Dame, Indiana.

Daniel M. Cantwell Papers, Chicago Historical Society, Chicago, Illinois.

Paul Hanly Furfey Papers, Bureau of Social Research, Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C.

Reynold Hillenbrand Papers, Sacred Heart Parish, Hubbard Woods, Illinois. (This collection is soon to be deposited in the University of Notre Dame Archives.)

Young Christian Student Papers, University of Notre Dame Archives, Notre Dame, Indiana.

Young Christian Workers Papers, 1936-1950, Sacred Heart Parish, Hubbard Woods, Illinois. (This collection is soon to be deposited in the University of Notre Dame Archives.)

Young Christian Workers Papers, 1950- , University of Notre Dame Archives, Notre Dame, Indiana.

Mrs. Mary Caplice Zotti Papers, Oak Park, Illinois. (This collection is soon to be deposited in the University of Notre Dame Archives.)

XUM

Other Sources

Interview with Patrick and Patty Crowley, June 14, 1970.

Interview with Burnett C. Bauer, December 18, 1968.

Interviews with Reynold Hillenbrand, June 10, 1970 and September 19, 1970.

Interview with Edward Marciniak, June 9, 1970.

Interviews with Mrs. Mary Caplice Zotti, October 3, 1970 and September 18, 1971.

XUM